

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
Regular Meeting )  
 )

Reported by:  
Martha L. Nelson

APPEARANCES

MEMBERS

Hamid Bahadori, Chair

Devinder Singh

Mark Greenwood

Emma Olenberger

Lt. David Ricks

Rick Marshall

Bryan Jones

Larry Patterson

Mike Kenney

John Ciccarelli

ALSO PRESENT

Richard Crompton, County of San Diego

Ahmed Aburahmah, City of San Diego

Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans

Don Howe, Caltrans

Kevin Korth, Federal Highway Administration

Gigi Finely, County of San Diego

Jay Walter

Jay Beeber, Safer Streets L.A. and Reason Foundation

Muna Cuthbert, City of Chula Vista

David Royer, Engineering Consultant

Sam Morrissey, City of Santa Monica

APPEARANCES

ALSO PRESENT

Gordon Wong, Caltrans

Tim Gotts, Plastic Safety

Amanda Dobbs, TAPCO

Jim Lissner

Bob Bronkall

# INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>Action Items:</u>	
1. Introduction	7
2. Membership	9
3. Approval of Minutes of February 19 and 20 Meetings	12
4. Public Comments	13
5. Public Hearing	
14-10	15
14-05	67
14-11	73
14-12	111
14-15	117
14-16	143
6. Request for Experimentation	
10-03	163
7. Discussion Items	
14-13	164
8. Information Items	
14-14	191
14-20	193
9. Tabled Items	
14-02	196
14-03	196
14-06	196
10. Next Meeting	196
11. Adjourn	204

1 PROCEEDINGS BEGIN AT 9:20 A.M.

2 (The meeting was called to order at 9:20 a.m.)

3 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 2014

4 MEETING BEGINS AT 9:20 A.M.

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Let's call to order the meeting of  
6 the California Traffic Control Devices Committee. And starting  
7 on the agenda, it's customary before we start -- it's customary  
8 before we start on the agenda that we give a few minutes to the  
9 agency that is hosting our meeting. And for this fabulous-  
10 fabulous facility here we definitely want to thank the County  
11 of San Diego for hosting the Committee here. And if you would  
12 like to share a few words?

13 MR. CROMPTON: Good morning. I'm Rich Crompton,  
14 Director of Public Works for the County of San Diego. And I  
15 really appreciate that you've come here to our beautiful  
16 location. We're proud of this -- this new facility. If you  
17 could have seen what we were in a few years ago, typically  
18 1960s kind of facility. So this is definitely a step up for  
19 us.

20 One thing that's really important that I understand  
21 you do, and I really applaud you for doing this, is how you go,  
22 as you're taking the meeting on the road to different parts of  
23 the state, it allows local stakeholders to come and provide  
24 their views to you. And I just have to applaud you for that.  
25 That is absolutely wonderful. We'll have a chance today, I'm

1 sure, for -- for some of the people here to provide input that  
2 maybe they couldn't do if the meeting was in Sacramento or  
3 somewhere far away.

4           While you're here I encourage you to take advantage  
5 of all the great things that San Diego has to offer. I know  
6 some of you may not have a lot of time here. The snack bar  
7 next door is -- has been selected. Their food is great,  
8 believe it or not, and prices are reasonable. So I encourage  
9 you to take advantage of that while you're here.

10           And I will say from a personal note, in the County of  
11 San Diego we've had Mike Robinson participated with this  
12 Committee, and now Mike Kenney. When Mike left we jumped at  
13 the opportunity to have participation with this group because  
14 we believe here in San Diego County that this -- what you do is  
15 extremely important. Because you're guiding the future of how  
16 our roadways are going to look.

17           And so there's kind of a double advantage for us.  
18 The one advantage is we get to provide input right here at the  
19 source. And then Mike and Mike, the two Mikes, they're  
20 bringing the information back so we know what's in the mill,  
21 what's coming, and then what the decisions are. We know it  
22 right then. It's not something where we're going to be at risk  
23 for not knowing that.

24           So appreciate that opportunity, and I appreciate the  
25 opportunity for allowing County of San Diego to participate.

1 So appreciate your coming here, and enjoy your time in San  
2 Diego. Thank you.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you very much. For the  
4 record, I have the privilege of serving on the County of San  
5 Diego Traffic Advisory Committee. And I come to this facility  
6 quite often for our meetings, but I never knew you have this  
7 fabulous room back here. And for the record, also, they're  
8 probably running the best Traffic Advisory Committee in the  
9 whole state. They're doing a fantastic job. Randy is there  
10 and Mike is there and they're doing -- they're doing a  
11 fantastic job. Glad to be here. Thank you.

12 Getting on our agenda, we'll start with introduction,  
13 and we'll start from that side of the table. Mr. Marshall?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Thank you. I'm Rick  
15 Marshall with the County of Napa Public Works Department. And  
16 I'm on this Committee representing Northern Counties.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I'm Larry Patterson.  
18 I'm the City Manager for the City of San Mateo, and attending  
19 my last meeting of the Committee.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: Bryan Jones, City of  
21 Fremont, Public Works Director.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: David Ricks, Lieutenant with  
23 the California Highway Patrol.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: And I'm Hamid Bahadori -- Hamid  
25 Bahadori representing Automobile Club of Southern California,

1 AAA.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Devinder Singh. I'm  
3 basically sitting on the Committee because my boss was not able  
4 to attend. So I'm an acting voting member today.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I'm Mark Greenwood,  
6 Director of Public Works for the City of Palm Desert, and I'm  
7 representing Southern Cities.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER OLENBERGER: Emma Olenberger with  
9 AAA Northern California, Nevada and Utah.

10 Committee Member Kenney:. I'm Mike Kenney with the  
11 County of San Diego, representing Southern Counties.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: John Ciccarelli,  
13 Bicycle Solutions San Francisco, representing (inaudible).

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Well, thank you all. It's also  
15 customary for members in the audience to introduce yourselves  
16 and tell us which agenda item you are here for. And I'll start  
17 with Ahmed.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Come to the mike, please.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: If they are not going to pick it up,  
20 I don't want everyone to come to the mike. It's going to take  
21 quite a while.

22 MR. ABURAHMAH: Good morning. This is Ahmed  
23 Aburahmah with City of San Diego. I work as a Senior Traffic  
24 Engineer and City Engineer. I would like to welcome all of you  
25 to our city and our county. And I don't have any items on the



1 agenda, but I just came to share that information.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you.

3 MR. ABURAHMAH: Thank you.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: Glad you are -- glad you are here.  
5 You don't need to walk to the mike. Just introduce yourself  
6 and which item you are here for.

7 (Whereupon off-microphone introductions were made  
8 and not transcribed.)

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. On the membership, on --  
10 on a sad note, this is the last meeting we will have the wisdom  
11 of Larry Patterson on the Committee. He -- last meeting we  
12 were in his city in San Mateo. And as the meeting was in  
13 progress he received a phone call. And he went outside and  
14 came back and said, "I got the job." And now he was promoted  
15 to the City Manager, and we congratulate him for that. We all  
16 right very, very happy for that. But we are sad that we are  
17 going to lose him on the Committee.

18 And we were told of this last week, so we have not  
19 had a chance to prepare an appreciation plaque for him. That  
20 will be done and delivered to you duly. And if you have a few  
21 words that you'd like to share with the Committee, Larry, the  
22 floor is yours.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Thank you, Hamid.  
24 Actually, it's been a really enjoyable experience. I think I'm  
25 one of those rare members who spent more time as an alternate

1 than I did as a member. But I appreciate you all recognizing  
2 the value of my promotion, which I am very pleased with.

3 I've -- I've enjoyed the California Traffic Control  
4 Devices Committee. I spent most of my career in traffic  
5 engineering, so it felt like home to me. I enjoyed the  
6 conversations and the discussions and the level of detail. And  
7 I, too, as the Public Works Director from San Diego County  
8 indicated, I find what this Committee does to be extremely  
9 valuable. It can be time consuming. It can definitely be  
10 detail oriented, without exception I think. But the value as a  
11 practitioner out in the field, of having the MUTCD and the  
12 California version available and clear in terms of what as a  
13 practitioner I needed to be doing on the street was invaluable.

14 So I'll certainly keep tracking what the Committee is  
15 up to. And who knows, one day I may be out in the audience  
16 with an item I want to bring forward.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you very much. It was  
18 definitely a pleasure working with you, especially in the  
19 Subcommittee for the Yellow Timing, we definitely used your  
20 guidance and wisdom. And looking forward to working with you.  
21 And your replacement Jay is there.

22 Jay, you want to say a few words about yourself and  
23 introduce yourself to the Committee. You will be joining us in  
24 the next Committee meeting. And I was kidding Caltrans staff  
25 last night over dinner, I said, "Jay is a former district

1 director of Caltrans, so he knows all your hand signs. You  
2 know, from now on just be careful."

3 Welcome, Jay.

4 MR. WALTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the  
5 commission [sic]. I'm excited to begin service on the  
6 commission. Of course, it's subject to confirmation, as I  
7 understand it. I'm not sure how tough that is. But in any  
8 case, I have a background working for Caltrans for just about  
9 20 years. And I was in the District 5 and District 6 Offices,  
10 Fresno and San Luis Obispo. I served as the District Traffic  
11 Engineering in Fresno for five years, and was the Deputy  
12 Director for Operations for another three. So I have some  
13 career understanding and educational background that I think  
14 helps me contribute to the Committee going forward.

15 I served as a Public Works Director in the City of  
16 San Luis Obispo for seven years, I believe it was. And I  
17 became acquainted with Rick Marshall at that time with San Luis  
18 Obispo County. So again, some familiar faces on the commission  
19 and opportunities to serve. I'm looking forward to that. And  
20 I believe that, you know, the way that the commission operates  
21 and the things that you do certainly create order for our  
22 motorists and drivers, and I think that's a very important  
23 thing. Predictability and consistency and all that. So again,  
24 looking forward to the opportunity.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you very much. Looking

1 forward to working with you. And in the introduction part I  
2 think there are three people over there that we forgot to go  
3 and allow them to introduce themselves, Johnny, Don and Kevin.

4 MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) Johnny Bhullar with  
5 Caltrans, the editor for California MUTCD. And I've been there  
6 from the get go since 2000, so I know enough to be dangerous.  
7 So I have reminders here of the applicable California  
8 (inaudible) make sure that I -- we interpret the manual  
9 correctly and also adopt it correctly and revise it.

10 MR. HOWE: I'm Don Howe from Caltrans. I'm the -- I  
11 work with signs, and I'm here to help support Devinder today.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Kevin?

13 MR. KORTH: I'm Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
14 Administration, California Division, Traffic Operations  
15 Engineering. I oversee the California MUTCD to make sure it's  
16 in substantial conformance with the Federal Highway  
17 Administration's National Manual on Traffic Control Devices.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Back to the agenda, on  
19 item three, approval of the minutes of the February 19th and  
20 20th meetings. Members, I hope you have had a chance to look  
21 at those minutes. And as they're verbatim, still, if you see  
22 any corrections or comments.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I'd move approval.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion. Is there a  
25 second?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Second.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion and a second. All  
3 those in favor?

4 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing none, the motion  
6 passes unanimously. The minutes of the meetings of February  
7 19th and 20th are approved.

8 Public comments. At this time members of the public  
9 may comment on any item not appearing on the agenda. Matters  
10 presented under this item can not be discussed or acted upon by  
11 the Committee at this time. For items appearing on the agenda  
12 the public is invited to make comments at the time the item is  
13 considered by the Committee. Any person addressing the  
14 Committee will be limited to a maximum of five minutes so that  
15 all interested parties have an opportunity to speak. When  
16 addressing the Committee please state your name, address and  
17 business or organization you're representing for the record.

18 Anybody who wishes to address the Committee --

19 MS. FINLEY: Good morning. My name is Gigi Finley.  
20 I work for the County of San Diego in the Traffic Group. And  
21 just something that I wanted to get feedback on -- I know that  
22 you can't comment on it today -- but we've been struggling with  
23 installation of parking signs as far as the arrows and the  
24 begins and the ends and having to install them at a 30 to a 45  
25 degree angle, if you're using the arrow signs. So we're trying

1 to find a way that maybe we can make that a little bit more  
2 clear. We've had issues with CHP indicating the arrows are  
3 unclear because they're not turned perpendicular to the  
4 roadway.

5 So is there any discussion in reviewing those items  
6 in the Cal-MUTCD and maybe giving a little bit more leverage as  
7 to how we can install the No Parking signs with arrows so that  
8 it's more clear to not only the CHP, but also to the motoring  
9 public.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: That's a very good comment.  
11 Caltrans?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I would suggest, Don, you  
13 work with Gigi and we can -- so we can communicate with you  
14 what's the problem and see how we're going to solve the  
15 problem.

16 Johnny, you want to add a comment?

17 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. Basically, what I'll say is that  
18 we do hear you when you're having those concerns. Because the  
19 City of San Jose, and I believe also City of Santa Monica, they  
20 had submitted public comments in this regard and we were trying  
21 to resolve it. It's a little bit complex issue. And because  
22 it deals primarily with local agencies, we do not have  
23 jurisdiction. But in one of our workshops we're going to work  
24 on it. And I believe we could not make it to the agenda for  
25 this meeting, but we are working on it.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So it's something that we  
2 expect to come back to the Committee, Johnny, sometime in the  
3 future?

4 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Because as part of those public  
5 comments, when we were looking at it (inaudible) we couldn't  
6 prepare it for this meeting. But it's one of those things that  
7 we are behind the scenes working on.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Great. So we will be hearing  
9 about that. Thanks for bringing it up.

10 MS. FINLEY: Thank you.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Appreciate it. Any other members in  
12 the audience who wish to address the Committee under public  
13 comments? Seeing none, we close the public comments.

14 Going on our agenda items, Mr. Singh, is there a need  
15 to change any agenda order or we just go in the order as on the  
16 agenda?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: We'll go as on agenda.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: We'll go as on the agenda. So we'll  
19 start with public hearings. And we'll start with Item 14-10,  
20 which is amendment to the various sections and figures of Part  
21 7, School Zones, of the California MUTCD 2012 based on public  
22 comments.

23 It's a Caltrans item. Who introduces the item?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Mr. Chairman and Committee  
25 Members, this item is placed on the CTCDC agenda because

1 (inaudible) 2009 National MUTCD and 2010 California MUTCD  
2 adoption process. We received some comments. And we were not  
3 able to address those comments during the 2012 adoption. So  
4 what we're trying to do now, to go over those comments and see  
5 if we agree, we placed them on the CTCDC agenda for Committee's  
6 consideration.

7 So if you go on page 9 of 46, there is 11 items  
8 basically under this item. And I will go one by one, go over  
9 one item and ask Committee Members comments, and we can go  
10 through all 11. Then we can ask the audience if you -- if you  
11 agree with me.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Members, if you have had the chance  
13 to look at this, and I see that Caltrans response to all of  
14 them is agreed. And do you want Caltrans Staff to go through  
15 these line by line, or do you have specific questions you want  
16 to answer -- you want -- Larry?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I mean, I think for me  
18 it would be better just to deal with the exceptions. Because I  
19 found all kinds --

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: -- of review to be fine.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. I agree. Any other thoughts  
23 and suggestions? Okay.

24 So, Devinder, maybe you want to just focus on the  
25 exceptions, rather than what you agree with.



1 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay. So if you go to page  
2 10, the comments came back from District 10 -- District 4  
3 Bicycle Advisory Committee. They want to insert red text to  
4 the California language just telling the engineers when you are  
5 going to read Part 7 you need to look at the other parts of the  
6 California MUTCD of traffic devices. So the statement -- the  
7 devices and statement described here in on how they're used in  
8 school zones and do not preclude the use of other devices and  
9 treatment described and stated in this manual, in this  
10 document.

11 So that's the statement we're adding on behalf of the  
12 District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee. And I will ask John  
13 Ciccarelli, because he's part of the group, if there is any  
14 background and what's the reasons.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Actually, I support the  
16 petition. But I'd make one simple edit suggestion, the word  
17 "be" or the word "use" is not needed.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. I agree. Yeah, use. That's  
19 right.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: That needs to be clear.  
21 Would that also apply to the second-time uses in there where it  
22 would preclude "use" at other --

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Because I think both of  
25 those "the"s could be removed.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yes. So the suggestion is to remove  
2 two "the"s in the -- in the sentence. So it's going to read,  
3 "The devices and treatments described herein are for use,"  
4 instead of (inaudible), "and also not preclude use."

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: If I could, Mr. Chair,  
6 are we're going to -- we talked about kind of looking at the  
7 exceptions here. Are we going to then deal with them as a  
8 whole, or you want action on each line item?

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: What's the pleasure of the  
10 Committee? Do you want to treat them one at a time or wait  
11 until we hear the whole thing? John?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I only had a few  
13 exceptions. And actually looking at the text, most of them  
14 have been addressed already by Caltrans. So the pleasure of  
15 the chair.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Well, usually if there are not  
17 controversial items we just deal with the whole package in on  
18 motion. But if there are controversial items then we throw out  
19 that item because someone members may want to work differently  
20 on that one.

21 If that's okay with the rest of the Committee, we'll  
22 just go through the whole list. Okay. Okay. Go ahead.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Page 11 of the agenda is  
24 comments came from District 4, too. They want to add to the  
25 figure -- National Figure, Pedestrian Route Plan Map. We

1 believe it's not making much difference. So we agree for them  
2 to add School Pedestrian Route -- Route Plan Map. This will  
3 also (inaudible) as for the aid of the California MUTCD we show  
4 like this one. So we will also make changes -- a change to the  
5 page 48 of California MUTCD indicting Pedestrian Route Plan  
6 Map.

7 Kevin we will give you the chance, after we go  
8 through all the proposals under this item.

9 MR. KORTH: All of them?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. I'm thinking maybe Larry's  
12 wisdom was okay. Maybe. Okay. Let's -- yeah, this can get  
13 out of control very --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: This is my last meeting  
15 here.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah, it's your last meeting. And  
17 you definitely something that's a lot of headache.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: What are we going to do  
19 without him?

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. What are we going to do? Can  
21 you Skype? Can you join us on Skype?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yeah. Right.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: So maybe it's clever to go back.  
24 And let's -- let's do them one at a time because I see that the  
25 feds may have some issues, and this can get complicated on

1 certain recommendations.

2           So the last one, all those in favor say -- oh, well,  
3 I need, actually, a motion for that change. All -- yes, John?

4           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I point of  
5 clarification. The reason for the insertion of the word  
6 "pedestrian" is because this is guidance over pedestrians.  
7 It's not necessarily true that a Bicycle Route School Map would  
8 have the same guidance. In fact, it would probably be very  
9 different.

10           CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Yeah. John, when we get to  
11 it we will -- people are going to discuss, and wherever it goes  
12 it goes. But my thing is that I -- if there are issues that we  
13 are going to have, not full agreement or members want to vote  
14 differently, that's going to be the opportunity.

15           So back to page ten, that change, that editorial  
16 change that -- the sentence in red that was added, let's have a  
17 motion on that one. Who makes a motion to approve that one?

18           COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I would move approval  
19 with the changes, the editorial changes to the language.

20           CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a motion for that change.  
21 Is there a second?

22           COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Second.

23           CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a second. All those in  
24 favor say aye?

25           ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing none, that  
2 change is approved unanimously.

3 Now let's go to the -- the School Pedestrian Route  
4 Plan. So I see the representative from FHWA having comments.  
5 Kevin, do you want until you hear all of them, or do you want  
6 to address them one at a time?

7 MR. KORTH: I prefer -- I prefer -- I'd prefer --  
8 this is Kevin Korth, Federal Highway Administration. I'd  
9 prefer to go line by line on each one.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Item by item?

11 MR. KORTH: Because there's -- the majority of them,  
12 I have a comment on, just ask the Committee what they believe.

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So the change is example of  
14 School Route Map -- Plan Map, now we are saying the School  
15 Pedestrian Route Plan Map. So -- and the reason for the change  
16 is, Mr. Singh, is --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: We received comment from  
18 District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee. And like John is a  
19 members of District 4 Committee, he can add more to that.

20 (Colloquy between Committee Members)

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Let's turn a couple of the mikes  
22 off. Maybe you have too many mikes on.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. I'm not aware  
24 of --

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: If you have -- yeah, if you have too

1 many mikes on it just doesn't let you speak.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I see. Okay. So we  
3 should be perhaps turning our mikes off after we speak; right?

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: Right.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Good. So I'm not aware  
6 of the input from District 4 BAC. But personally, when I've  
7 seen this figure in the past I've realized that it doesn't  
8 apply to bicycle route guidance. So pedestrian clarifies the  
9 pedestrian path.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Any other members who have  
11 comments on this before we hear from -- okay. Kevin?

12 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
13 Administration. I would recommendation no change to the  
14 National MUTCD figure. I would let -- there's many discussions  
15 of this figure within the text already, section 7A-1, Paragraph  
16 7, section 7C-02, Paragraph 1, and within the legend itself it  
17 describes the figure to the nature of figure 7A-1.

18 A question I'd ask here in California, is a bicyclist  
19 on a sidewalk considered a pedestrian or considered a bicyclist  
20 by state law. Some states it gets a little sticky between the  
21 definition of a pedestrian and a bicyclist.

22 Renaming the figure could have legal implications.  
23 Also -- so I'd just let the -- the text within the MUTCD  
24 describe that figure. In case there's any changes within the  
25 paragraph in the next manual, we won't have to go back and

1 rename the figurehead. If all road users are considered in  
2 this figure in the future, that we just use simple figure  
3 heading and let the paragraph describe it.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: A comment.

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: This figure is a  
7 pedestrian route figure. And I would say that the -- the  
8 exposure for this figure being used for bicycle route guidance  
9 could be there as well. A bicyclist is a different animal on a  
10 sidewalk. It travels at speeds that are incompatible with  
11 decision making at obscured driveways. It engenders behaviors  
12 such as riding into intersections without yielding. The figure  
13 should not be overloaded to serve as a bicycle route figure, as  
14 well. Instead, a separate figure should be developed if that's  
15 the direction that the agency wants to go.

16 School Route -- Safe Routes to School Active  
17 Transportation is about transporting people, empowering people  
18 to transport themselves according to their skill level. Young  
19 kids belong on a sidewalk with adult guidance. But at a  
20 certain level, third or fourth grade depending on the street  
21 network, kids should be on the street.

22 And so I feel strongly that the federal figure should  
23 evolve in such a way that it becomes pedestrian only, and  
24 bicycle guidance be added, and guidance for practitioners in  
25 constructing a bicycle route to schools should be added. This

1 is a fundamental part of active transportation.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: Mr. Patterson?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
4 just wanted to point out that I don't have strong feelings one  
5 way or the other, so I'm happy to go along with the Committee.  
6 But the one thing I would point out is that in the legend to  
7 the figure it references pedestrian routes only. I mean, it  
8 does not make any reference to bicycles. So if I take the  
9 figure as a whole and its examples of School Route May -- Route  
10 Plan Map, and then I look at what the arrows indicate, it is  
11 not bicycles and pedestrians, it is strictly pedestrians. So  
12 that's why I don't feel strongly that it would need to be  
13 changed. But again, I'm not sure that's causing that big of a  
14 problem either.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: Any other members of committee who  
16 which to speak? Mark?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Yeah. I don't see any  
18 reason to modify the federal figure here. I think it's -- I  
19 think to revise that reflects an unnecessary level of  
20 precision. And this is relatively generic. It is not one size  
21 fits all. And we shouldn't get into the habit of wordsmithing  
22 every figure so that it tries to portray a precision that just  
23 doesn't exist.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: Any other comments? Okay. So then  
25 let's -- since we are taking one item at a time, is there any



1 member of the public who wishes to address the Committee on  
2 this specific item? Johnny?

3 MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike) Johnny Bhullar. I agree  
4 with Kevin, as well as Mark on this, that once we start going  
5 (inaudible) titles of the figures lay out most of the stuff,  
6 then it feels like too detailed. And I'm okay to leave  
7 (inaudible).

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Any other comments?  
9 Seeing none, and nobody from the public, so let's make a motion  
10 on this specific item to whether -- is there a motion to even  
11 go with the recommendation and add the word "pedestrian"?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Well, we -- we will go along with  
13 the Committee (inaudible). But if the Committee believes there  
14 is no need to change, we are okay with that.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: We need to dispose of it in like a  
16 procedural manner.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Is there -- is there a motion to go  
19 and add the word "pedestrian"?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Could I suggest a  
21 different motion?

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yes, Larry.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I would move that we  
24 recommend not -- to not include the -- the change.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a motion for not changing

1 and keeping the title of the figure as is. Is there a second  
2 for that motion?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Second.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion and a second.  
5 Okay. All those in favor say I?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Aye.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Aye.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: Aye.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Aye.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER OLENBERGER: Aye.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Aye.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Aye. Opposition?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Abstain.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: There are two nos. The motion  
16 passes. How many members do we have present?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: We had ten.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: We have all ten. Okay.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: I'm abstaining.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So we have -- we need seven  
21 motions to -- we need seven ayes to pass. The motion passes  
22 with seven ayes, one abstention, and two nos.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Is it -- is it -- Mr.  
24 Chair, is it possible to --

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yes, sure.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- to offer a brief  
2 comment on why I voted no? The reason I voted no is because  
3 I've been on standards committees at the federal level, and now  
4 the state level for 12 years now, and I've seen all too often,  
5 unfortunately, where a practitioner follows something that  
6 seems innocuous to us as Committee members, literally. I was  
7 having a conversation with Dave Royer just before the meeting  
8 about a specific table, which I'm not going to go into, in Part  
9 6. And he described literally the way that it had been  
10 misinterpreted that led to injury, if not loss of life by  
11 taking the term literally.

12 So I think the details do matter. I've registered  
13 my -- my feelings on this. I don't want to belabor the point.  
14 But I don't think that it's a trivial matter when the  
15 understanding of things is down to words by some practitioners.  
16 Thank you.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Thank you for sharing  
18 your comments.

19 Next item is, Mr. Singh?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: This is item (inaudible)  
21 page 12 of 46.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Which page are you looking at?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Page 12.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: Page 12. Okay.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: The comment came from Mr.

1 Dean Lemon, Deputy Director. And the comment is  
2 -- he suggested we should refer other figures, other examples  
3 of school location (inaudible) signs and then California School  
4 Assembly for a typical installation as shown in 7B-1(CA). But  
5 he commented there's another figure that is shown same signs.  
6 So we should add 7B-4, 7B-5, and 7B-5(CA). So we believe  
7 that's accurate. And we just inserted other figures into the  
8 California MUTCD section 7B.03.

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: Any comments? Seeing none, do I  
10 have a motion to approve?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: No. Public comments.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Public comments. Anybody on this  
13 issue? This is more editorial. We're just adding some  
14 figures. Nobody from the public? No comments from the Members  
15 of the Committee? Is there a motion to approve the  
16 recommendation?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I would move approval.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion. Is there a  
19 second?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Second. All those in favor say aye  
22 please.

23 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing none, the motion  
25 passes unanimously. Okay.

1                   Next one?

2                   COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Next page, 13 of 47, the  
3 comments were received from City of San Jose. They recommended  
4 in California we do not use "such as photo radar system." So  
5 we agree with them and we crossed out that text.

6                   CHAIR BAHADORI: Any comment?

7                   COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

8                   CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Just -- just -- just a  
9 clarification. Are they using photo radar for speeding  
10 enforcement but it's not allowed in California, but the photo  
11 radar is allowed for other uses such as signals?

12                  COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: And this is -- if we look at  
13 the section about the School Advance Warning Assembly with the  
14 supplement plaques --

15                  CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. I think here you're saying  
16 specifically for speeding, because it says "speeding or other  
17 traffic violations." I mean, like you can't use it for  
18 speeding. But obviously in a school zone it can be used for  
19 enforcing a red light violation.

20                  I don't have a strong feeling about it. I'm just  
21 saying that I understand the City of San Jose, they have their  
22 NASCAR (phonetic) project and they did it for a few years  
23 illegally and then they scrapped it. So that's why probably  
24 they want the words to come out of the manual also.

25                  COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Neither do we. At Caltrans

1 we will get the Committee comments, if the recommendation of  
2 the Committee agrees there's no need to delete any text, we're  
3 fine with that.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: No. I'm just -- I'm just saying  
5 that I understand because now some of their constituents may go  
6 back and imply that the manual -- the California MUTCD allows  
7 the use of photo radar for speeding, which is not true. Use of  
8 photo radar is not allowed in California for speeding, period.  
9 So maybe that's why they want a modification. I have no  
10 problem with it. I just wanted to share the background.

11 Any comments on this?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah.

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: John?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It seems to me that  
15 conformity with the federal manual is an issue down to words,  
16 as it was for the title of that school figure, that the  
17 direction of the Committee should be to leave the words in.  
18 And furthermore, Section S (phonetic) qualifies the term photo  
19 radar systems, softens it in such where it doesn't in any way  
20 to my reading imply a requirement for its use or encouragement  
21 of its use.

22 So if we're going to be keeping in mind to not  
23 deviate from the federal language where there's not a  
24 compelling reason to do so, I would say don't mess with it.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: So we have a motion?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I move that we do not  
2 delete the term.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion not to delete the  
4 term and keep the manual text as is. Is there a second? Is  
5 there a second for that motion?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I can second.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a second for the motion.  
8 Any discussion? Okay. Before we vote, yeah, anybody in the  
9 audience wanting to speak on this? Mr. Beeber?

10 MR. BEEBER: Thank you. Jay Beeber, Safer Streets  
11 L.A. and Reason Foundation.

12 Yeah, as long as you brought this up, and I just  
13 happened to be here to -- to comment on this, you have to be --  
14 yeah, I think you should delete this -- this wording. People  
15 do look to this. And you may get into a situation, since  
16 this -- since the State of California does not allow photo  
17 radar systems in the State of California and you may run into a  
18 situation where the legislature may come back and say, oh, now  
19 we have to direct you to delete things and -- and do things  
20 like that. So I would -- I would say that it would probably be  
21 a good idea to take the recommendation and delete those words.  
22 Thank you.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: I think the conformance  
25 issue is with the CVC which doesn't allow photo enforcement

1 (inaudible) and it very clearly says V (phonetic) here. So I  
2 think we are more or less correcting the conflict for us.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: I'd recommend we approve  
5 it.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: And I completely understand. The  
7 only thing I said is that it says for fines for speeding or  
8 other traffic violations. So for other traffic violations a  
9 red light camera can be used, but not for speeding. And again,  
10 you know, MUTCD can not -- doesn't even have jurisdiction to  
11 talk to that because that's a legislative matter, enforcement  
12 issue.

13 So anyways, I don't have a strong feeling about it  
14 anyways. But there's a motion not to change the language and  
15 keep it conformant with the federal document, and there's a  
16 second on that. Any further discussion? All those in favor  
17 say aye. Opposition?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Please raise your hand.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah, raise your hand. Ayes, raise  
20 your hand. We have --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: One, two, three --

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- one, two, three for the motion.  
23 And the opposition? One, two, three, four. And abstention?  
24 Okay. Four for abstention. The motion does not pass. We need  
25 seven votes to pass it. Okay.



1           So is there an alternate motion, a motion to go with  
2 the Staff recommendation and delete the words?

3           COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON:   So moved.

4           CHAIR BAHADORI:   There is a motion.   There is -- is  
5 there a second?

6           COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY:   Seconded.

7           CHAIR BAHADORI:   There's a second.   All those in  
8 favor say aye.   I go aye.

9           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH:   Raise your hand.

10          CHAIR BAHADORI:   Actually, raise your hand.   One,  
11 two, three --

12          COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH:   Yeah.   We have --

13          CHAIR BAHADORI:   -- four, five, six, seven -- well,  
14 actually, it's nine.   Is that -- Chief, did you vote yes or no?

15          COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS:   Oh.   Yes.

16          CHAIR BAHADORI:   Okay.   We are --

17          COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH:   It's unanimous.

18          CHAIR BAHADORI:   We are unanimous.   So we go -- we go  
19 with the Staff recommendation and the mark -- and MUTCD will be  
20 edited accordingly to take those words out.

21                 Next one please.

22          COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH:   The next item, Mr. Chairman,  
23 is on page 14.   Actually, it's two items.   On the second  
24 paragraph, top of the page, recommendation (inaudible)  
25 signaled controlled locations.   Do you want to take one by

1 one so we can ask maybe (inaudible) signaled controlled  
2 locations?

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Okay. Any -- any comments,  
4 any questions from the Committee on the change from signaled  
5 to controlled? Seeing none, any member of the audience who  
6 wish to address the Committee on this? Seeing none, is there a  
7 motion to approve the recommendation?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I would move approval.

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion. Is there a  
10 second?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a second. All those in  
13 favor say aye.

14 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Hearing none, the  
16 motion passes unanimously, the changes recommended.

17 Next one.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Mr. Chair, on the same page,  
19 page 14, if you look, the paragraph on the bottom --

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Uh-huh.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: -- the comment was in the  
22 school zone we had before end of school zone or "End School  
23 Speed Limit." The comment was we can also put speed limit,  
24 actual speed limit, actual speed limit. So put "End of School  
25 Zone" or actual speed limit.

1           But if you go to the bottom -- bottom of the page  
2 under option, option, if you read it, it says standard "Speed  
3 Limit" sign showing the speed limit for the section of highway  
4 that is downstream from the authorized and posted reduced speed  
5 limit may be mounted on the same post above the "End."

6           So option allowed to put both signs. And under  
7 standard we're saying you can put one or the other. So if we  
8 want to make changes in the standard, one or the other, we have  
9 to either eliminate option or we can say "as under shown in  
10 options," so we just have option to either put one sign, "End  
11 of School Limit" or "Speed Limit," or they can put both.

12           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: A questions.

13           CHAIR BAHADORI: Mr. Marshall.

14           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: The language at the top  
15 of page 15, am I correct that the usual presentation is -- the  
16 wording in blue is already in, and the wording in red is the  
17 only thing that is a proposed change?

18           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Correct.

19           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay. Thank you.

20           CHAIR BAHADORI: Well, it's a local agency sign  
21 implementation issue. We would like to hear from our local  
22 agency reps, see what you guys think.

23           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So you want to use one sign  
24 or you want to use both? There's -- if we want to use both  
25 then we have to change the standard. We have to insert some

1 language in the standard saying except under shown in option.  
2 Because the option allows you -- you can put both signs, one on  
3 the bottom.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So maybe --

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: I'm sorry. Mr. Bhullar, do you have  
6 anything to add, answering Mr. Marshall, or are you waiting?  
7 Okay.

8 Go ahead, Mr. Marshall.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Well, the nature of my  
10 question was the -- the sentence at the top of page 15 appears  
11 to say what's already in the manual allows the choice. And the  
12 change in red, in both of these locations, it's just making it  
13 consistent with what's already in the book. I don't see a  
14 problem with that.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Can I ask a quick question?

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yes, Mr. Kenney.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: This text on page 14, we're  
18 allowing the end of the school zone to be demarked by the  
19 "Speed Limit" sign as opposed to an "End School Zone" sign; is  
20 that what we're doing?

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Either/or.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: We tend to heavily engineer  
23 the signage around schools. We probably would continue to use  
24 the -- the "End School Speed Limit." But I guess I don't have  
25 a problem with an option if there other agencies that prefer

1 the "Speed Limit" sign.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: Mr. Bhullar?

3 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. I just  
4 want to explain a little bit of background on this issue. This  
5 issue actually came from the feds in terms of the feds, what  
6 they wanted to do was that any time we were entering an school  
7 zone and we have the reductions in school zones, what was  
8 happening is but there was no indication downstream -- once you  
9 passed the school boundary or in front of the school the  
10 vehicle starts speeding up, not realizing where actually the  
11 speed limit reduction was supposed to end. So in 2009, and  
12 that's what we adopted in 2012, was that you have to somehow  
13 mark that the school speed limit that was reduced has ended.  
14 And you can do it in a number of ways.

15 So here what we are trying to do is just probably  
16 gage from the Committee here, do you want to do the speed  
17 limit -- new "Speed Limit" sign downstream after you cross the  
18 school? Do you want to do just the "End School Speed Limit,"  
19 or even both? Those are the three options that you can look  
20 at, and we'll modify the manual accordingly. But the  
21 indication from it effectively is that somehow do mark the end,  
22 what is the new or where does it end.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Mr. Jones?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: Well, if you mark the end  
25 of a "School Zone" sign with a speed limit, that "Speed Limit"

1 sign could be within the school zone saying what that block is  
2 normally when school is not in session. So it could be  
3 prematurely ending, and so you might need to be moving some  
4 signs or relocating some signs in jurisdictions, which I'm not  
5 sure if all jurisdictions have surveyed, especially in some of  
6 the rural jurisdictions where they might have a 55 on a county  
7 roadway or something like that, and if that 55 is within that  
8 school zone, because when the school is not in session that  
9 roadway is 55.

10 So -- and I could see it also in may rural or  
11 suburban communities, because many of our roadways are 45 or 50  
12 through -- through the school when it's not in session.

13 MR. BHULLAR: So that's why it's even more important  
14 to indicate, I mean, because of the confusion probably with the  
15 school zone or the school boundary where it says the speed,  
16 where -- where does the school speed limit, 25 or 15 or 20,  
17 where does it end that you can restore back to? So it becomes  
18 even more important to mark it somehow.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: John?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have a question for  
21 CHP, an enforcement question. First, a basic question about  
22 the "Speed Limit" sign and its enforcement. From the  
23 enforcement perspective is the verdict still out to begin  
24 accelerating of changing speed to comply with the "Speed Limit"  
25 sign as soon as it's within their view? How does that work?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Well, they actually -- they  
2 shouldn't get up to that speed limit until they've reached the  
3 sign, whatever the new sign is that they're coming across.  
4 Just because they're seeing it in the -- in the distance  
5 doesn't mean they can start getting up to that speed at that  
6 point.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. But when they  
8 pass that sign, physically pass it, they are allowed to be at  
9 that speed?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Yes. From that sign forward  
11 they --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: -- they can get up to that  
14 speed.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And is there any  
16 difference in the enforcement context for the "End School Zone  
17 Speed Limit" sign?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: I'm not sure I understand  
19 what you're asking.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, as that the start  
21 of the school zone there is a special "School Zone Speed Limit"  
22 sign posted, which is what we're talking about here.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Right.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And then we're trying  
25 to determine how to end that with signage. Would the expected

1 behavior on the part of the traveling -- the motorists, in this  
2 case, be any different if it were signed with that S5-3 versus  
3 an ordinary R2-1?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: That's -- that's hard to say  
5 what -- how the motorists are going to interpret it. I  
6 would -- I would say the best -- the best bet would be to have  
7 "End School Zone Speed Limit" sign out there, just to avoid any  
8 confusion.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, that's -- that  
10 was my concern. I'm not a well-practiced practitioner in terms  
11 of constructing school zone signage. But in my mind I want the  
12 end of the place where I should expect the motorist to exercise  
13 special behavior to be very clear. And I'm concerned that just  
14 placing an R2-1 doesn't really make it sufficiently clear that  
15 the school zone has ended. So that's one of my concerns.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: That's a good point that you raised.  
17 I mean, it's just such a nuance of the law here. I mean, like  
18 if I'm a driver and I'm driving on the highway, and I consider  
19 myself a safe driver and relatively well educated when it comes  
20 to the road law, and I see a sign that says "Speed Limit 45  
21 Miles Per Hour," and I can see that sign very clearly from 500  
22 to 600 feet before I get to that sign, I assume I can go 45  
23 miles.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: That's my assumption. That's just a



1 common sense assumption. But maybe from what I'm hearing  
2 that's not the law. I can not be at 45 until I'm at that sign.  
3 So if there is a school zone and we are putting something that  
4 says the posted speed limit, 34, 45, whatever after the 25  
5 mile-per-hour zone, then there must be a sign that clearly says  
6 where the school speed limit stops. And I think otherwise,  
7 hey, I'm -- I'm maybe right in front of the school, but I can  
8 still see the signs 600 feet away that says 45, I say I see the  
9 sign, 45.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: Mr. Jones, I would agree  
11 with you. In our construction zones we have -- when we reduce  
12 the speed for a construction zone we say "Construction Zone  
13 Speed" --

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: -- this, and then at the  
16 end of the construction zone we say "Construction Zone Speed  
17 Ends."

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Ends. You need to know where it  
19 ends.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: And so whenever we're doing  
21 something special with the speed, for whatever the adjacent  
22 land use or -- or construction activity is occurring, we should  
23 have a beginning and an end --

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: -- of that, rather than

1 having the regulatory, especially because the school zone speed  
2 is only when children are present, not throughout the day. And  
3 so there could be another posted speed limit on that half-mile  
4 stretch of roadway that could be within the school zone that  
5 would -- could be confusing motorists of when it ends and when  
6 it begins.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: So your -- your suggestion is to  
8 keep the "End" sign?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: My motion would be to keep  
10 the "End" sign for school zones.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Mr. Patterson?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I second.

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: So there is a motion to keep the  
14 "End" sign as a required, and there is a second on that. Is  
15 there any discussions?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Yes.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Let's go, Mr. Greenwood?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I agree with the motion.  
19 But I think it leaves the manual with conflicting language. I  
20 mean, what Caltrans was trying to do here was clarify language.  
21 And now I agree with not clarifying, but I think we need to  
22 take an additional action to say that you must post the "End"  
23 sign.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: Kevin, let's here from Federal  
25 Highway.

1           MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
2 Administration. The proposal as written would say that you  
3 have the option to put -- or it becomes a standard statement  
4 that you use either the "End School Speed Limit" sign or a  
5 "Speed Limit" that was occurring prior to the speed -- the  
6 school speed zone. And so with it being placed into the  
7 standard statement it becomes redundant when it occurs at the  
8 end of the optional statement in paragraph six. So however the  
9 Committee wants to choose the three combinations the -- as it's  
10 proposed in the agenda here it's redundant in the standard  
11 statement and the optional statement there, as you can see at  
12 the end of paragraph six.

13           So I'm in favor of whatever you guys choose for  
14 those, the three combinations. But as it's proposed right now  
15 it's redundant in the manual.

16           CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. I just -- I'm glad you  
17 mentioned it. Because when I read it, actually, you know, last  
18 week I was looking at this and I said I didn't see the  
19 confusion as a practitioner if I was reading it because I see  
20 the option, not just the option of signage but of putting signs  
21 on the same post. Maybe I misread it. But I didn't see the  
22 option giving you the option of doing either. The option was  
23 telling you, you can put both signs on the same post. That's  
24 all it said. So -- but maybe there were some people who had  
25 confusion, that's why Caltrans said they need to clarify.

1           Mr. Singh?

2           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Well, after listening to the  
3 comment, Mr. Chairman, we agree with the comments, and we  
4 should not make any changes. Leave the language as it is.

5           CHAIR BAHADORI: So the Caltrans who -- well,  
6 actually, technically, I have a motion, so -- and the motion is  
7 exactly that, right --

8           COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: I believe so.

9           CHAIR BAHADORI: -- not to mess around with the  
10 language and keep it as is. And I mean, because when I read it  
11 was not confused because the option was not to the signage but  
12 to the combination of sign on the same post.

13           Anyways, so there's a motion to keep the language as  
14 is. And a second. Any discussion? John?

15           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I want to make sure  
16 what I'm voting on. So the motion is to not have the red text  
17 in the standard statement?

18           CHAIR BAHADORI: That's correct.

19           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Thank you.

20           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Can I make a suggestion?

21           CHAIR BAHADORI: Of course.

22           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Because I had the same  
23 misunderstanding that was just described. I think it might  
24 help to address the language that's in blue at the top of page  
25 15 to say that the "Speed Limit" sign may be installed on a

1 separate post, or something along those lines that indicates  
2 the "End School Zone" sign is still required because posted by  
3 itself it sounds like only it and not the other, potentially  
4 sounds like that. I think it would be more clear to say you  
5 need both, you absolutely need the "End School Zone," that's  
6 what I hear our intent to be. And I you want you have the  
7 option of putting them on one post or two. And in some way  
8 that needs to be clarified here because I don't think it's  
9 clear.

10 Is this a friendly amendment to the motion?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: I'll take that as a  
12 friendly amendment.

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: And Jeff?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: The second item is not  
15 clear then what that wording would be on the top of 15, because  
16 it says that it may be posted by itself. So it's in a section  
17 that's talking about ending the school zone speed limit, and it  
18 says that you can you post them together or post them by --  
19 post it by itself. And I'm not sure if -- all I need to know  
20 is what is that wording then if you want to clarify it?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Where the "Speed Limit"  
22 sign may be installed on a separate post.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Okay. I can agree with  
24 that.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Did you hear that, Mr. Singh?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes. Okay. So under option  
2 you want to insert language, the speed -- "The 'Speed Limit'  
3 sign may be installed on a separate post." Right now the  
4 option is you can put above the "End of School" limit sign.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: Well, rather than by  
6 itself, posted by itself, he's saying posted separately.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes. So we can -- we can  
8 include that text under the option.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: It would be deleting the  
10 existing text and replacing it with the text that was just  
11 described. So instead of "be posted by itself" it would say  
12 "may be installed on a separate post."

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So instead of the same post  
14 it would need to be a separate post? So we have to then  
15 correct all the backgrounds at --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: No. No. I don't think  
17 we're there yet. This is still an option about putting them  
18 both on the same post. It's saying exactly the same thing, I  
19 think, as the existing language, but providing some  
20 clarification. Instead of saying "be posted by itself" it is  
21 saying "can be installed on a separate post," saying -- just  
22 that -- just that wording, that is deleting "be posted by  
23 itself" and replacing that with "may be installed on a separate  
24 post."

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So if I'm reading the option

1 statement --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: That's --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: That's my intent. The --

4 the language that's the beginning of paragraph 6 at the bottom

5 of page 14 --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: -- would remain

8 unchanged --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: -- thus it still provides

11 for it to be mounted on the same post.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: And where --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And then --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: And where you want to add

15 the new language?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And then continuing

17 across the page break it would say -- the -- the blue language

18 would be edited to say "or the 'Speed Limit' (R2-1) sign may be

19 installed on a separate post" --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: -- and the rest would

22 continue.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay. Got it.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Question.

25 MR. BEEBER: Okay, John.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Actually, a friendly  
2 edit suggestion. Instead of using the word "installed" use the  
3 word "mounted" to be parallel to the first phrase. It's  
4 stronger.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yeah.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: That's fine with me too.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I think that's better.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. We typically use the word  
9 "mounted."

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Is it possible to strike  
11 the -- the showing the speed limit on the section of highway  
12 that's downstream from the authorized posted speed limit? Do  
13 we -- do we really need to specific why we're putting up the  
14 "Speed Limit" signs since we're just talking about what post  
15 they can go on? I think that would make it much clearer.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Do you have a question?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: "The standard 'Speed Limit'  
18 sign may be mounted on the same post above the 'End School  
19 Speed Limit' or the 'Speed Limit' sign may be posted by  
20 itself." I think that would make the sentence a little bit  
21 clearer, everything from showing --

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: I think if you could speak to the  
23 mike, I'm not sure if everyone is hearing you.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: So in line item six it  
25 would just strike everything from "shown" to "zone." "Showing



1 the speed limit for the section of highway," if we got rid of  
2 that phrase of left "a standard 'Speed Limit' sign that may be  
3 mounted on the same post above the 'End School Speed Limit'  
4 sign or the 'Speed Limit' sign may be posted by itself. It  
5 would speak directly to the sign, whether it posted it with the  
6 other sign or by itself. And that would be much clearer. I  
7 think it's very difficult to get through the first 20 words of  
8 the sentence.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: That makes sense to me.  
10 The only speed limit you would be posting there would be the  
11 one that applies downstream, etcetera. There -- there would be  
12 no other speed limit to post there, so why not take out those  
13 words?

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: You got that?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So the maker of the motion  
17 and the second are all okay with the discussion and  
18 suggestions.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: Yes.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yes.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So anybody public? Mr.  
22 Beeber?

23 MR. BEEBER: Thank you. Jay Beeber, Safer Streets  
24 L.A., Reason Foundation. I concur with the -- with the motion.  
25 And one of the reasons is, first of all, for clarity of

1 motorists, knowing where that ends. But also you may not be  
2 aware that there is a bill pending in the legislature currently  
3 that would enhance penalties within a school zone for all types  
4 of things, not just for speed limits. So if that were to  
5 become law it would obviously be necessary to have that "End of  
6 Speed Limit" sign. So I just wanted to alert you to that.  
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thanks. Yeah, that bill is still in  
9 the committee. Okay. Any other comments? Okay. All those in  
10 favor of the motion, say aye.

11 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Hearing none the motion  
13 passes unanimously.

14 You got all the language, Mr. Singh?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: And if you didn't, we've got the  
17 verbatim minutes.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I will ask if I need any  
19 clarity.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. I'm so glad we took Mr.  
21 Patterson's advice and we are doing this one at a time. There  
22 was no way we would have an agreement on the package. So  
23 moving on to the next one.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Page 15 was already  
25 addressed, you know, with the -- with page 14. So if we move

1 to page 16, we received a few comments. The existing language  
2 talks about 15 mile speed limit in the school zone, but there  
3 is no mention of 20 miles per hour. So we decided, based on  
4 the comment, we said we can just add 20 or 15, just to make  
5 it -- clarify it, basically, hey, if 15 is not justified they  
6 can justify 20 miles per hour too. So that's the only proposal  
7 is to have 15 or 20. And then based on that, if you look at  
8 page 17, the cross is "School Speed Limit" sign will be  
9 restored, we will keep it, and then we will create existing  
10 language option to guidance and we add another paragraph as the  
11 option.

12 So that was the comments received from a few  
13 agencies. And we said it makes sense to clarify if 15 is not  
14 justified and 20 is justified, it can be used.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: And once again, you know, just to  
16 refresh your memories, State Law was changed, when was it, two  
17 years ago or four years ago, that allows establishing below 25  
18 in the school zone. But below 25 it can be either 15 or 20.  
19 So that's the clarification.

20 Any comments? Questions? John?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Not really. I have no  
22 issue with this. I want to share how a pedestrian involved  
23 engineering assessor thinks about this. Around 20 or 15 miles  
24 per hour, but certainly around 20 or below many conflicts tend  
25 to be resolved without a collision. So there's -- there's good

1 reason to get speeds down. It would be nice if everybody  
2 actually drove ever under the posted speed limit, but I think  
3 any tool is useful. And I'm in support of this because I think  
4 some agencies may be hesitant to post a 15 limit, but be less  
5 hesitant to post a 20. From my perspective as a pedestrian  
6 safety person I think 20, if we can get behavior to 20 it  
7 actually could resolve most of the -- most of the conflicts  
8 without collisions. So I think it's a good thing.

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: And that is just -- we're just  
10 clarifying what the State Law already allows cities to do.  
11 Kevin?

12 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
13 Administration. My comment is more about the stricken language  
14 and the standards statement. I believe it should -- the  
15 proposed deletion should be kept to be consistent with --

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Which -- which page are you looking  
17 at?

18 MR. KORTH: On page 17.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Page 17 on top. Okay.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I already said we would keep  
21 the existing language there.

22 MR. KORTH: Okay. I missed that.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yeah.

24 MR. KORTH: Thanks.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yeah.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: So you're not going to delete that?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yeah. We're not -- we're  
3 not going to strike it. We'll keep that language.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: I see a hand in the audience.  
5 Please come to the podium, introduce yourself.

6 MS. CUTHBERT: Muna Cuthbert, City of Chula Vista.  
7 Something related to speed and speed limit in school zone. It  
8 would be good if we have some guidance on if we have a speed  
9 limit on an existing road, 45 miles per hour, even 50 miles per  
10 hour and we have a school zone -- a school close by, and how  
11 close to -- is it to facing the road and not facing the road,  
12 where is the access? Sometimes we have driveways. Sometimes  
13 we have fence. Sometimes we don't have a fence. And how we  
14 would use the speed limit from 45 to 50 to 25 within a school  
15 zone? So sometimes like we have some -- and some section of  
16 MUTCD is not easy to break it down from 50 to 25 right away, or  
17 you have to say a reduced speed limit, school speed limit, how  
18 we address that? If something, maybe a future meeting maybe  
19 would be good, if we could have some guidance on that it would  
20 be appreciated it.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. I mean, on the school I think  
22 the -- it's not the MUTCD. The California Vehicle Code says  
23 very clearly that the school ground must be contiguous to the  
24 highway.

25 MS. CUTHBERT: Yeah.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: So you must be -- you must be  
2 abutting the highway. Otherwise the section of the Vehicle  
3 Code doesn't apply.

4 MS. CUTHBERT: Yeah. But --

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah, but it doesn't say about  
6 fences. But your school must be right on the highway. If it's  
7 in the proximity of the highway it can't be used. And the  
8 reduction, that's -- that's the challenge. Because these are  
9 like part-time speed limits when children are present only. So  
10 I don't know. I defer to my better learned colleagues on this.  
11 If you have like a 45 zone and we say this area is 25 only for  
12 like when children are present, whatever that means, anybody  
13 have any wisdom on that?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: My suggestion is this  
15 probably deserve a broad discussion and some material to help  
16 us prepare. I don't think I'm prepared to talk about it today.  
17 So maybe we could agendize it for some other time.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you very much for bringing it  
19 up. I think on the first one there's no need to do anything in  
20 an MUTCD because the Vehicle Code very clearly says you can  
21 do -- reduce the speed zone only if the school ground is  
22 contiguous to the highway.

23 MS. CUTHBERT: Yeah. But sometimes like you have an  
24 access driveway but not really access for pedestrian. Some is  
25 not 100 percent clear, but I appreciate you are --

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. But the second one, and the  
2 first one also, very important. So, Mr. Singh, is this  
3 something -- or colleagues, is this something you want to look  
4 in the future meetings to see if it's worthy of any changes?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: We can go along with that  
6 (inaudible) if there is some need to address it. But if public  
7 agencies believe there need to be some discussion we can have  
8 this discussion in the future. Maybe a subcommittee, a few  
9 people from this Committee and some Caltrans staff.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Well, let's receive your comments  
11 for now and then discuss it. And if there is willingness on  
12 the part of the local agency reps, and I think in this case  
13 like Mr. Kenney represents the southern part of the state --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: I'm fine.

15 MR. BEEBER: -- and then if he sponsors something,  
16 puts it on the agenda, we'll definitely need to have that  
17 discussion.

18 MS. CUTHBERT: Thank you very much.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Any other comments or  
20 questions? Okay. Do we have a motion on this already?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: No.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: No? Okay. Is there a motion on  
23 this?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I'll move approval.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Mr. Marshall makes a motion. Any

1 second?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second. And all of  
3 those in favor say aye.

4 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Seeing none, the motion passes  
6 unanimously.

7 Mr. Singh, next one.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Page 18, the figure was  
9 modified based on the previous text comments. So since we're  
10 not changing the test, so we will leave it alone. So it will  
11 be not changed.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Moving on.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Next will be the same thing,  
14 you know, it will be not changed. We will add these two  
15 location signs that are missing. We will add the sign, but  
16 we'll eliminate the "or".

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Moving on.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: This comment was -- came to  
21 show two things. One comment is would like to show a flashing  
22 beacon on top of the sign. So if you look at figure -- page 20  
23 of 47, we show the flashing beacon separate, and the sign  
24 below. So what we propose to show the flashing beacon top of  
25 the sign. That's one thing. Other sign comment was came to



1 show the mirror image of the pedestrian crossing. Based on the  
2 comments we agree and any comments from the Committee?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Uh-huh. I have a  
4 couple. I believe the flashing beacon should be labeled as  
5 optional. And also the mirror image is in accurate as shown on  
6 this -- this exhibit. If this was a raised median the mirror  
7 image would be appropriate. But if you imagine yourself from  
8 top of the page to bottom, the image as originally shown is  
9 correct. The arrow there should be down and to the left, not  
10 down and to the right.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So existing flashing beacon  
12 does not say optional. So we are okay for -- if we need to put  
13 "Flashing beacon is optional." Existing figure does not say  
14 flashing beacon is optional.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: But mirror image, I will ask  
17 Johnny to make clarification, because he's expert on that.

18 MR. BEEBER: Johnny Bhullar. And since this comment  
19 was made, and I agree in part, but basically what happens is  
20 that in the manual the feds allow the mirror image of any sign  
21 to be made in the entire manual. However, since we don't show  
22 it in the manual what happens is that most of the time out in  
23 the field, and it was also a problem for Caltrans, that we  
24 always show the pedestrian walking in one direction. And even  
25 though the signs are posted on both signs, the pedestrian on

1 the left is like as if the pedestrian is walking out of  
2 intersection. So sometimes when we have the diagonal arrows,  
3 we have the diagonal arrow pointing this way but the pedestrian  
4 is walking that way.

5 But the reason why is because even though the manual  
6 acknowledges it in text, but it does not show it in the  
7 figures, a lot of engineers are not aware. But when we had the  
8 same question for our district staff we found out that there  
9 was actually another reason for that, which was that in our  
10 sign contract we have regular sign as part of the contract.  
11 But if you did the mirror image, in that case it became a  
12 special sign and we had to spend extra amount of money just to  
13 purchase that. So the engineers, for that reason, were not  
14 using the mirror image.

15 But nothing stops the engineers from any sign in the  
16 entire book to have a mirror image. So that's here we are just  
17 taking this as an opportunity for showing one option which is  
18 show it in one location, not at others, so that starts you  
19 thinking that, yeah, that is allowed.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Kevin? Let's hear from Kevin.  
21 Kevin? Nobody can hear you from there. I meant, for her.

22 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway. Just to  
23 kind of jump on Mark's point, I think showing the mirror image  
24 sign with the separate arrow as an option is okay, but we  
25 should not delete the leading arrow showing the sign there on

1 the left side of the page. It should show a double-backed sign  
2 so that -- as you said, the southbound traffic needs to be able  
3 to see the pedestrian crossing into the street. But then on  
4 the northbound, if you had a double-backed sign, then you would  
5 use that mirror image on the left side of the road. So it  
6 should -- that post should be a double-backed sign on that  
7 post, and then both leading arrows can remain.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Mr. Patterson?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I think that covered my  
10 comment. I think the way it's shown is not correct. But if  
11 you did show back-to-back signs then you would use a mirror  
12 image. If they wanted to show it that would be the way to show  
13 it. I'd be okay with that.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I realized after Mark  
16 Greenwood made his comment that his comment is exactly correct.  
17 If you're going to have a single sign on each approach, a  
18 right-side sign, it's not -- it should not be mirrored because  
19 the pedestrian is approaching from the right to the left.  
20 However, I agree with others that there is value, since there's  
21 only one figure that really addresses this, in showing an  
22 option for the double-backed sign where the left-side view is  
23 the mirror image sign. Furthermore, I've run into more or one  
24 circumstance where the sign company doesn't have the mirror  
25 image sign because it's not in the manual. So it's a chicken

1 or egg situation here.

2           So either leave the figure alone because it actually  
3 is correct as shown and as Mark points out, with the exception  
4 of the option beacon. Two separate issues. Or add an optional  
5 double-backed sign on both sides to indicate that as an  
6 optional condition you can double-back the signs and give a  
7 bracketed guidance. That very valuable, not so much on a two-  
8 lane road which is depicted very schematically here, but on a  
9 multi-lane road.

10           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So if I hear correctly the  
11 flashing is going to be optional? Yeah? Okay.

12           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Here is the flashing  
13 beacon here.

14           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay. Okay.

15           COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I'm not sure that was  
16 put in the form of a motion, but I'm prepared to do that.  
17 Which would be that on this item we would approve the optional  
18 flashing beacon or it should be shown as an optional flashing  
19 beacon. I think that's what you're saying. But that for the  
20 mirror image that the figure would actually be changed to have  
21 back-to-back signs so that the mirror image sign could be  
22 illustrated as an option.

23           CHAIR BAHADORI: So that's the motion. Is there --

24           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: No. I'm sorry. Larry, the  
25 figure heading is with the flashing beacon. So if you look at

1 the heading of the figure, "Example of Signing for Traffic  
2 Control in School Area with Flashing Yellow Beacons." So we  
3 can not say flashing beacons optional, especially in this  
4 figure.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So we can take other  
7 recommendation. It's page 20 of 46.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Johnny, you want to say  
9 something? No? Okay.

10 So, Mr. Patterson, was that your motion?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yes. The motion is  
12 that, yeah, we not add the optional word into the flashing  
13 beacon, but that the figure be modified to have the optional  
14 mirror image sign shown on the back side of the existing signs  
15 that are shown.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion. Is there a  
17 second?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a second. Discussion?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Not discussion,  
21 actually a question for Johnny in terms of figure practice in  
22 the manual. If we wanted to show such an optional double-  
23 backed sign -- an optional double-backed sign and an optional  
24 use of the mirror image on the left side of the double-backed  
25 sign, would that be done with -- by depicting a double-backed

1 sign and only a double-backed sign with the word optional  
2 applied to the left side, or would the figure show both -- this  
3 could get really cluttered -- a single sign or a double-backed  
4 sign? I'm just trying to educate myself on our figure  
5 practice.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Well, the way that -- Johnny Bhullar  
7 with Caltrans. The way the policies are on the pedestrian  
8 crossing and how you mark them, the crossing sign is optional  
9 for the school crosswalk here. The arrow is a requirement if  
10 you are posting it at the location. The sign is optional if  
11 you do it in advance. You can do either just advance, but if  
12 you're going to do advance then you're required to do the one  
13 at the crossing. But if you don't do the advance you can just  
14 do it at the crossing. So that's how some of the options work.  
15 And to show it back-to-back, yes, in those cases we'll just  
16 show those as an example. We don't want to try to do the  
17 policy in the figure.

18 So what we do is, you might have noticed already,  
19 that in a lot of these figures we try to on purpose show one  
20 direction say one speed, in another direction another scenario.  
21 So we randomly try to use one feature and not the other, or  
22 sometimes both. So we try to show examples because we can not  
23 show all the scenarios. So here was an issue where in the  
24 entire Part 7 we had no location where we had shown, I would  
25 say a high-visibility crosswalk type of features, in this case

1 being on both sides, and trying to also use a mirror image  
2 feature as an example.

3 Did that answer your question?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think so. So if I  
5 understand you correctly, you show an assortment of things with  
6 the idea that the practitioner will get the idea that there's  
7 some flexibility in each part of the context. So for this  
8 figure you would, if I hear you correctly, probably show a  
9 double-backed sign on one or both sides of the street at the  
10 crossing location?

11 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. And the intention was, actually,  
12 to show back-to-back on both sides.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Great. I like that.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Mr. Jones?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBERS JONES: We've been using a lot of  
16 double-backed signs and they work really well because they make  
17 the crosswalk a lot more visible, especially at uncontrolled  
18 intersections, because often times if it's a multi-lane roadway  
19 the motorist in the number one lane can see the one on the left  
20 side of them a lot easier than on the right side, or if there's  
21 a curvature in the roadway, a horizontal curvature in the  
22 roadway, they'll be looking at the left side versus the ride  
23 side. And when you have separated sidewalks, big bike lanes,  
24 parking lanes and everything like that, the one on the right  
25 could be 40 feet horizontal from the number one lane. And so

1 it's out of their sight cone driving down the roadway. So the  
2 left one often is very -- is even more useful.

3 So I would encourage putting in an example where  
4 there is a double-backed sign so it encourages more people to  
5 do that, especially in school zones or in pedestrian areas.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: Good comments. John?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. It makes me  
8 recall the St. Petersburg research that was done in the mid-  
9 2000s for the rapid flashing beacon. They found a  
10 statistically significant difference between what they call a  
11 two-sign installation and a four-sign installation in which you  
12 can place a left-side sign. There was substantially yielding  
13 compliance with the left-side sign on the median versus on the  
14 left-side of the roadway. Not quite the same issue, but  
15 speaking to the effectiveness of the motorists seeing both  
16 sides.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Any more comments? We  
18 have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye.

19 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? The motion passes  
21 unanimously.

22 Next item, Mr. Singh.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So let's go to page 21. We  
24 are changing the text showing -- indicating 15 or 20 miles per  
25 hour in school zone. However, we want to also show in the



1 figure, when we make changes on the figure we show, if you look  
2 at page 21 of 46, we show one cross street 20 mile and 15 mile,  
3 which is now corrected. So if we take an east-west street it  
4 both should show same speed. So one will show 15 and the other  
5 will show 20-20. The reason we show the guidelines on speed --  
6 how to set a speed limit, it says that you can not have  
7 different speed on undivided highway. So this is undivided.  
8 So divided highway, yes, we can have different speed limit each  
9 direction.

10 Now the only correction we'll make is where we show  
11 15 and 20, we'll have one street at 15 and another street with  
12 20 miles an hour.

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: But -- but that's going to be even  
14 more confusing. Mr. Howe, come to -- because the State Law  
15 that allows the consideration of -- of 25 below speed limit  
16 specifically says that it must be a two-lane residential  
17 street. So these -- these signs will work -- these signs are  
18 allowed only on a two-lane residential street.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So --

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: So you're not -- you're not allowed  
21 to have a speed -- a speed limit.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Correct.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: If you decide in the school zone to  
24 go 15 or 20, it's for both directions.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: But, yeah, that's why we

1 Can't have 15 and 20 mph on the same street.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: You can not have 15 in one direction  
3 and 20 in the other one.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: We agree with your comments.  
5 So we will correct this figure. So we will show on street 15-  
6 15 and other --

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: -- other street 20.

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: Two streets can have two  
10 different --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- two different speeds, but the  
13 same street can not have two different.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: Mr. Howe?

16 MR. HOWE: I was going to say that in note number  
17 three we should probably say 15 or 20 school zone --

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah, that's true.

19 MR. HOWE: -- if we're going to be making that  
20 change.

21 And if I understand correctly from your previous  
22 discussion, we can't have 15 miles an hour on the 25-mile-an-  
23 hour residential street going left to right in the figure and  
24 have 20 miles an hour as the new figure going -- or the new --  
25 new speed on the top-to-bottom direction.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. On the -- on the other two --  
2 yeah. On -- on the two streets you can have two different  
3 speed limits, one 15, one 25. On the same street you can not  
4 have two different speed limits.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So we will change this  
6 figure accordingly.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: And again, you know, it's one of  
8 those things that if you are a practicing traffic engineer and  
9 it's the same school, you probably won't use 15 or 20 for both  
10 speeds even. You don't want to have two different ones.

11 Any other comments or questions on this figure? No?  
12 I don't think we're going to need a motion because this is  
13 like -- mostly like changing figures around.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Correct.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: We already voted on the motion -- on  
16 the issue.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Moving on. We are done.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: We're done with this item,  
20 Mr. Chairman.

21 So next is the interim approval issue by the FHWA on  
22 the use of optional use of bicycle signal face.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Go ahead.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: We -- this item was on the  
25 agenda during the last meeting. And John Ciccarelli, our

1 Committee Member, asked -- he drafted the language, discussed  
2 with the Committee, and CBAC requested not to take any action  
3 during the last meeting and they will bring to this meeting.  
4 However, I have not received any proposed language from the  
5 CBAC or from John Ciccarelli, thus, the reason I placed on the  
6 agenda again because some local agencies want to use these  
7 options. However, I will ask John to provide an update of what  
8 their position is because we -- we tabled this item during the  
9 last meeting because the CBAC requested that.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Are the members still fresh in their  
11 memories about what this whole thing is all about?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So Mr. Ciccarelli?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I gave a pretty  
15 detailed background last time, so I won't repeat the territory.  
16 But by way of update, the District 4 BAC Task Force  
17 Subcommittee and local engineers that are familiar with bicycle  
18 issues at signals have been refining the language. We now have  
19 language ready to go forward. It did not make the packet  
20 deadline, so we can't act on it at this meeting. My intention  
21 is to be bring it to the next CTCDC meeting. Clearly that  
22 meets -- that misses Johnny's goal for the 2014 update to the  
23 California MUTCD.

24 I had a side discussion this morning with both  
25 Devinder and Johnny about how does this work since we missed

1 the 2014 deadline. He says for a compelling issue like this  
2 that's deemed of high significance by local agencies, what's  
3 done is either a policy memo, or if it's much more involved a  
4 transportation operations policy directive, a TOPD, and he  
5 said -- gave some examples of issues that have been handled  
6 that way.

7           So it's my hope that the Committee will support the  
8 language that I bring forward from the District 4 BAC and the  
9 engineers who have commented at the next meeting. And then  
10 that be forwarded to Caltrans for issuance of a policy memo  
11 after a discussion with the chief in that branch.

12           In -- to the specific matter at hand, which is  
13 whether or seek state-wide blanket approval or any sort of  
14 adoption of the Federal Interim Approval 16, Bicycle Signal  
15 Faces, I would -- if a motion is necessary I'll move that we do  
16 not seek such approval because the Interim Approval 16 as  
17 written precludes certain existing uses of bicycle signals in  
18 the State of California as already permitted under California  
19 MUTCD, which led in the addressing bicycle signals years ago.

20           And specifically, some of the -- one of the three  
21 restrictions in the interim approval would preclude the use  
22 with pedestrian hybrid beacons. Pedestrian hybrid beacon is a  
23 way to get signal-like control of an intersection that doesn't  
24 meet full signal warrants, but there's bicycle and pedestrian  
25 flows across it. It's been a question is how do you indicate

1 clearly what's expected behavior of the crossing bicyclist?  
2 Because the crossing pedestrian gets a conventional pedestrian  
3 signal, and yet bicyclists interpret pedestrian signals during  
4 the countdown phase as saying they still have an exclusive  
5 movement. Where, in fact, on a pedestrian hybrid beacon the  
6 motorists coming on the street being crossed is getting a  
7 flashing red, a stop and proceed.

8           Berkeley and its engineers have come forward with a  
9 facing, a proposed facing, that we believe solves this issue.  
10 So as part of the language we'll be bringing forward we will  
11 specifically include text that provides a suggested phasing for  
12 use with bicycle signal face next to a pedestrian hybrid beacon  
13 that solves -- solves the problem. It's -- it's well thought  
14 through, and Berkeley would like to proceed with that, of  
15 course, without experimentation.

16           So we think we've covered all the bases. We know  
17 it's not going to make it into the 2014 MUTCD, but we think we  
18 have a path forward that will satisfy the practitioners. So  
19 I'll be bringing this back for a motion at the next meeting.

20           CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you very much. Very  
21 informative. Covered all the background.

22           Are there any questions? Mr. Patterson?

23           COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: This is obviously coming  
24 back. I'm not. So I thought maybe it was a good time, maybe I  
25 could ask a question just for clarification.

1           And I was looking on page 30 of 46. There's an  
2 example that shows how to prevent bicycle left turns in the  
3 particular case that's shown in the figure. And I started  
4 thinking through it and I thought, well, if you look at the  
5 vehicle signals very possible, and probably pretty likely, you  
6 would have a left-turn arrow as the left most signal head on  
7 the mast arm, and then you'd have two green ball -- or, you  
8 know, a red-yellow-green-ball signals. And then on the  
9 vertical pole for the mast arm you would have a bicycle signal.

10           But if, and assuming that the phases were running  
11 concurrently -- and I don't know enough about these signs yet,  
12 whether they are only used when there is a specific phase for  
13 the bicycles -- but I was operating on the assumption, and I  
14 didn't see anything that precluded using concurrent phases,  
15 that then the motorist approaching the intersection would --  
16 and the bicyclist would see a permissive indication for all the  
17 vehicles but an exclusive indication of the straight and right-  
18 turn arrows for the bicycle. And at the same time you could  
19 have pedestrians who also would then have their signal  
20 indication that would be showing as well.

21           And it just seemed to me to create some confusion for  
22 everybody because the -- there is no exclusive protective, I  
23 mean, movement for the bicycles in this particular example, I  
24 don't think. So it's just a question. And maybe as you're  
25 clarifying some of the other relationships with the pedestrian

1 countdown heads or other things, that there might be something  
2 that would be helpful. But that was just a question, looking  
3 at the figure.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So, Mr. Patterson, this item  
5 will be on the agenda of the next meeting. And you will see  
6 the proposed language by John Ciccarelli. So if you have  
7 comments to write, general comment or -- you can --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Okay.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: -- provide me your comments  
10 I will share with Committee members.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Okay.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And in response to  
14 Larry, that proposal we'll be bringing forward is considerably  
15 simpler than the interim approval. It basically could be  
16 thought of as an enhancement and updating of the existing  
17 California MUTCD language separately on a separate track. The  
18 language is going forward at the national level, which has the  
19 same sort of level of complexity and completeness as the  
20 federal interim approval, actually even more so. And that will  
21 be, hopefully, headed for adoption in the 2016 Federal Manual,  
22 and presumably our 2018 California Manual.

23 I haven't looked at every single case. It is quite  
24 complicated. And I sort of waived on that saying, no, we're  
25 going to bring forward the simpler language.



1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: And I appreciate that it  
2 will come back. And I also appreciate that there's been  
3 substantial research in this area and that there have been some  
4 favorable results. So I was really asking more of a  
5 practitioners question than challenging the recommendations at  
6 all.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I just want to clarify for  
8 the record, local agencies are asking about this interim  
9 approval. And they going to ask for approval from the FHWA.  
10 The FHWA not giving approval they're saying, hey, talk to the  
11 CTCDC. So just for the record, until the CTCDC makes a  
12 recommendation, local agencies can not proceed authorization  
13 from FHWA.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. So this will go back on  
15 the agenda for next meeting. Thank you.

16 Moving on, item number 14-11, amendments to various  
17 sections and figures of Part 9, Bicycle Facilities, of MUTCD  
18 2013 based on public comments.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: You want to break for five  
20 minutes or not?

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: What's the pleasure of the group?  
22 Do you need a break or do you want to keep going? Need a  
23 break? It's ten to 11:00. Let's break until 11:00. We'll  
24 reconvene the meeting at 11:00. Thank you.

25 (Off the record at 10:50 a.m.)

1 (On the record at 11:02 a.m.)

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: We'll call the meeting back to  
3 order. Okay. It's 11:02. We call the California Traffic  
4 Control Devices meeting of May 14 back to order. We start with  
5 item 14-11, amendments to various sections/figures of Part 9,  
6 Bicycle Facilities, of the California MUTCD 2012 based on  
7 public comments.

8 Mr. Singh?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Mr. Chairman, this item is  
10 also initiated due to the public comments. And on your --  
11 right here there is a table, I put separate sheet which is  
12 bigger size if you want to look at. And this is a bicycle --  
13 all the comments are related to bicycles. And I'm going to  
14 rely on John Ciccarelli if there is any technical issue, his  
15 expertise. I need his assistance. But we can go over -- the  
16 first item is on page 34.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Let's handle these the same  
18 way we did with the schools.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: So let's go item by item.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So, John, do you want to  
22 provide any input on the statement shown on agenda page 34?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think the background  
24 that Caltrans provided to this item is pretty clear. There's a  
25 sign that clearly -- clearly indicates where on a bicycle

1 permitted section -- segment of a freeway the bicyclist must  
2 exit. And likewise, at the onramp there's a sign that  
3 prohibits all sorts of traffic. But if a bicycle is actually  
4 allowed to enter the freeway and proceed on the freeway the  
5 bicycles portion of that prohibition sign is struck. But  
6 what's missing from the -- the structure is something that  
7 informs the motorist that this is a segment of freeway on which  
8 bicycles are to be expected, presumably on the shoulder.  
9 Furthermore, it's useful to tell the traveling public how long  
10 they are going to be traveling on the shoulder.

11           The other thing is that it's not just motorists who  
12 never bicycle and bicyclists who may or may not motor. But if  
13 I'm thinking about doing a long-distance tour I may be well  
14 aware that I'm allowed to travel on freeway shoulders and  
15 planning to use that as part of my bike tour. Knowing how far  
16 the freeway is bicycle legal is a really useful piece of  
17 information.

18           So for all sorts of good reasons there is a need for  
19 this information. And the way to provide it is this plaque  
20 which has the next -- next miles structure. So it's proposed  
21 that W7-A3 plaque, I guess that's a plaque, be allowed in  
22 combination with the W11-1 which is the bicycle warning sign.

23           CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you. Do you have any  
24 questions for John?

25           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And it is -- it is a

1 warning thing because it informs the traveling public of  
2 something they might not otherwise be aware of.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: I mean, we usually do that for all  
4 kinds of warning, we say expect such and such your next five  
5 miles, next ten miles.

6 Any questions?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: And just clarification. If  
8 this Committee makes a recommendation it will also affect page  
9 35, too, so 34 and 35 is one item.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Page 35 on that page, 9B-1 on 35,  
11 it's the same motion on the same issue that we're going to  
12 discuss.

13 Seeing no questions, no comments, any members of the  
14 audience? Seeing none, do I have a motion for approval for  
15 this change?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Move approval.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a motion. Is there a  
18 second?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Second.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion and a second. All  
21 those in favor say aye.

22 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing none, the motion  
24 passes unanimously. The change is recommended.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay. Now go to page 36,

1 Mr. Chairman. What we're recommending, in the text we show  
2 G93C California sign, although it was not in the heading. So a  
3 comment came from the public and we changed the heading just  
4 showing the sign which is also in the text.

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Basically making it  
7 clearer to practitioners how they can provide guidance to a  
8 bicycle parking area. Sometimes the location of the area is  
9 not obvious. If it's in a shopping mall, for example, it may  
10 be further in the perimeter of the mall so it can't be seen  
11 from an approach. So you need to kind of trail blaze and lead  
12 bicyclist to the area, kind of like leading car users to a car  
13 parking garage. Like I tried to find the county garage this  
14 morning, succeeded, and parked on the fourth floor. So more  
15 flexibility on the arrow usage.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Any questions or comments on  
17 this change? Any members of the public? Seeing none, is there  
18 a motion to recommend the change?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'll move approval.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a motion. Is there a  
21 second?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: I'll second.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a motion and a second. All  
24 those in favor say aye.

25 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing none, the motion  
2 passes and the change is recommended.

3 Next one.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: The next item is page 37,  
5 John, I'm not sure why we're deleting that, maybe you have  
6 background on this deletion text from the guidance statement.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The reason for the  
8 deletion, as I understood it from reading it in preparation for  
9 the meeting, was that 11 to 13 feet is unduly restrictive.  
10 There may be parking plus bike lane combinations where the  
11 total width is 15 feet. So there's no need -- there's no value  
12 added by specifying the width of the parking area.

13 I know that, for example, I think Oakland now uses a  
14 minimum of 13 feet for bike-plus-parking combination, and San  
15 Francisco is going more towards 14 feet, in sort of a belated  
16 recognition that a car door is a factor that should be factored  
17 in. And car doors, if you look at the research that was done,  
18 actually for the shared lane -- was it the shared lane marking,  
19 yes -- it was in the shared lane marking study the 85th  
20 percentile in car door opening was 9.5 feet. So door zone is  
21 about to ten feet. There's not a lot of riding area in an 11-  
22 foot bicycle lane that includes parking. It's mostly door  
23 zone. So cities that have the width to do it are -- and und  
24 the issue are going to 14 feet in some case. So nailing it  
25 down to numbers in here is unduly restrictive. That's the

1 reason for the change.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Any questions or comments on  
3 that proposed change, which is to delete that 11 to 13 foot  
4 between the bike lane and the curb? Okay. Seeing none,  
5 members of the audience? Seeing none. Is there a motion to  
6 approve the change?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Move approval.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion to approve. Is  
9 there a second?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER OLENBERGER: Second.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a second. All those in  
12 favor say aye.

13 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing none, the motion  
15 passes unanimously. The changes are recommended.

16 Next one.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Page 38 of the agenda, Mr.  
18 Chairman, we're making these changes to be consistent with the  
19 Highway Design Manual.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So it's like more editorial  
21 than anything, or probably don't need recommendation anyways.

22 Moving on.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The issue here is that  
24 bicyclists need a rideable surface, of course. And where  
25 there's a gutter you can't really count on the gutter being

1 rideable, not only the gutter but the -- the seam -- the  
2 longitudinal joint between the asphalt and the -- and the  
3 concrete. And it gets complicated, though, because in many  
4 cities a 2-foot 24-inch gutter is the standard, but in many  
5 other cities that's not the standard; 18 inches is routinely  
6 used, and in some areas 12 inches is used. And there's also  
7 slot drains where you have a buried pipe which has continuous  
8 longitudinal exposed inlet, and the gutter can be quite small.  
9 What the bicyclist needs in that case is at least, as we've  
10 done it in the manuals in California, at least three feet of  
11 rideable area, so three feet of asphalt. So creating a  
12 standard's formula that succinctly expresses this, both in the  
13 absence of a gutter and in the presence of a gutter, that's  
14 really what's going on here. We're wrestling with language  
15 that expresses both conditions.

16           The figure that supports this does show both  
17 conditions. But the figure itself has historically been based  
18 on the assumption of a two-foot gutter. That's what this is  
19 trying to resolve.

20           CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Any questions or comments?

21           COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Sir?

22           CHAIR BAHADORI: Yes, Mr. Kenney?

23           COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Is there a diagram of that?

24           CHAIR BAHADORI: A diagram referring to the change in  
25 page 38?



1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Yes.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: Is that what you're talking about?  
3 Is there a diagram, Mr. Singh?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: No, there's not a diagram,  
5 just how I would -- we'd be making these changes to be  
6 consistent with Highway Design Manual Figure 301.2A. So if you  
7 look at the Highway Design Manual, the Figure 301.2A shows the  
8 dimensions. And we don't have it here.

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: Is there a need to duplicate that  
10 here?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: No.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: No.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Is there a need to make a reference?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Well, I selfishly, I don't  
16 want to see added width. One, it may result in less and fewer  
17 bike lanes if I can't get the width. And it's costly. I'm  
18 just -- imp not quite understanding whether this is additional  
19 width.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: This is minimum.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: So if we're adjusting the  
22 minimum street width, I'd just like to see how that's going to  
23 change what is required.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: I understand what you're saying.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: As I understand it

1 the -- as I understand it the proposed change is actually  
2 reducing --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Wait. You're saying from  
4 five feet to three feet, basically.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: It's not increasing.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. Three feet was  
8 always the intent.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Well, I mean, it used to  
10 be -- it used to be four feet, and then it went to five -- it  
11 used to be four feet, unless you were next to a gutter, an  
12 eight -- a two-foot gutter, so it had to be five feet. And  
13 then it went to five feet specifically. And now it's being  
14 proposed to be reduced to three-foot if there's a two-foot  
15 gutter, so we're kind of going back to what we had before?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think it still  
17 suffers from the indeterminacy of the gutterway. Okay. I  
18 would -- what I would like to see, and I think was the original  
19 intent, was that in no case, gutter or no gutter, should the  
20 rideable area be less than three of or four feet. So if you  
21 could imagine a gutter that starts out at two feet, and so the  
22 old formulation was four feet if there's no gutter, so that's  
23 four feet of pure asphalt or concrete, I guess, okay, and then  
24 in the case of gutter it was something like three plus two.  
25 Now, as a thought experiment imagine the 2 starting to drop, so

1 2 becomes 1.4. That still works because the total width is  
2 4.5. Now the 2 becomes -- 1.5 becomes 1. Now you're down to  
3 three foot of asphalt and one foot of -- of concrete. But if  
4 it goes less than that I think four foot should always tame.

5 So the wording in here that becomes with a comma "but  
6 not less than four feet" and ending with "gutter exists"  
7 somehow has to be written so that we don't go less than four  
8 feet. And I think that's -- that's just been historical  
9 practice. I would like to see cases where you've got -- I  
10 can't imagine a six-inch gutter. Help me out, Public Works  
11 people.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. I think -- I think on your  
13 screen now, the typical Class 2 bike lane that the Highway  
14 Design Manual has on Figure 301-2A.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So now per the figure in  
17 front of you, you can look at Highway Design Manual figure,  
18 four feet minimum, three feet minimum.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I actually like how the  
20 figure is shown because it -- it gives -- makes sure that the  
21 bike lane is at a minimum of five feet, and that you have to  
22 have three feet of it as asphalt.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: It matters to be because I  
24 have lots of roads with no curb and gutter, and I now have a  
25 five-foot bike lane where I used to have a four-foot bike lane.

1 So are we going -- in instances where you don't have any curb  
2 and gutter are we now back to a four-foot bike lane? I read  
3 this as you've got to have a five-foot minimum.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: If you're up against a curb  
6 you've got to have a five-foot minimum.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No. The -- as I -- I'm  
8 waiting -- waiting for the red. As I read the proposed edit in  
9 the second line of paragraph 35 it has two clauses, not less  
10 than four feet or -- it used to be five, now it's struck to  
11 three feet of pavement if a gutter exists. So it's just --

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. We used --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- it's gutter --

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: We used to say four feet minimum, or  
15 do five feet minimum if there's a gutter. Now all that we're  
16 saying is that if you have a gutter, make sure three feet of  
17 the five feet is pavement.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Pavement.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: That's all the changes --  
21 clarification we're making.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: So there's a bit of an  
23 inconsistency, as I see it, between the Highway Design Manual  
24 and the MUTCD. I can't see an instance here where you could  
25 have a four-foot bike lane with curb and gutter in the -- in

1 the Highway Design Manual. It used to be in there, and then it  
2 was removed. I guess if you adhere to the MUTCD and the  
3 Highway Design Manual you're never going to see a four-foot  
4 bike lane, unless you're between a right turn and (inaudible).

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman?

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yes, Mr. Marshall?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: A question. Why does the  
8 Traffic Control Devices Manual need to address this one element  
9 of highway design in the first place? What is the context of  
10 having this here? And couldn't we just say lane widths should  
11 be consistent with the requirements of design standards and not  
12 have to duplicate? Would that help or not help?

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: Question for --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I will ask Johnny and John  
15 to address that.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: We will not -- just my first  
17 reaction is that we are not really introducing this. It's  
18 already there. It's been there. And I understand your  
19 question. But I'm saying we are not introducing this into the  
20 manual. It's been there as part of the standard for as long as  
21 I remember. It's just that we are just clarifying, that's all  
22 we're doing. But your question is like more on the principal:  
23 Do we even need to have a standard like this?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Well, what happened, based  
25 on the CBAC comment, the Highway Design Manual was changed and

1 it was not reflected in the California MUTCD. So we're just  
2 matching now what was changed in the Design Manual.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Well, Johnny, do you want to answer  
4 Mr. Marshall's question as to even if we need to have this kind  
5 of here since it's already in the Highway Design Manual? And,  
6 of course, Highway Design Manual is not being deleted, only the  
7 Caltrans document or --

8 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. Johnny Bhullar. Here is the  
9 issue is that the design features have changed. And the signs  
10 or markings are supposed to only be after the fact. Once you  
11 come up with the design they need to support the design. So --  
12 but since there was the change and they needed to be  
13 reconciled -- so whatever depiction or the scenarios were for  
14 the design in this figure were not being reflected in our  
15 figure, but our figure was showing another way. So what we  
16 needed to do was our figure needs to address these situations  
17 and how do we mark these situations.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. And again, you know, I'm  
19 going back -- I don't want to introduce any more confusion, but  
20 Highway Design Manual is a Caltrans document. California MUTCD  
21 is a state document. Everybody has to live by the California  
22 MUTCD. But no agency is under any law that says you have to  
23 use the Highway Design Manual Section 3, Chapter 3 of Highway  
24 Design Manual. They can develop their own cross-sections.

25 So back to Mr. Marshall's question, do we need to add

1 the standard here? I still think if you want to have a  
2 standard bike lane in the state we should because Caltrans  
3 Highway Design Manual is not a state document, it's only an  
4 agency document. But I will defer to you.

5 MR. BHULLAR: So my response to that is that the real  
6 purpose of the figure in the MUTCD is to support this design  
7 figure. We can do more if you want to, but at a minimum the  
8 figure in the California MUTCD needs to reflect what the design  
9 figure is and how would you mark this sufficiently.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Actually, Johnny, it's not  
11 the Design Manual.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: So, Mr. Kenney, do you still have  
13 concerns or --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: No. I think I understand  
15 it. And I have no objection to the text in red.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Are there any comments or  
17 questions?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes. I have --

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Sure.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have a suggestion. I  
21 think that there's a way to change the proposed edit in such a  
22 way that it achieves our purposes. I want to run something by  
23 the Committee.

24 What I'm trying to create here is never less than  
25 four feet, regardless of gutter. And if gutter, never less

1 than three feet of asphalt. Okay. If both of those conditions  
2 apply then you can never create a situation where you have --  
3 I'm just playing here -- a three-inch gutter, four feet of  
4 asphalt, and you call it a bike lane, three-foot -- three-foot  
5 three-inch bike lane. So if -- if the wording read something  
6 like "the approach roadway shoulder width" comma --

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: It can say "not less than four  
8 feet" --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And -- and "not less  
10 than three feet of pavement if the gutter exists."

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. You can say "not less than  
12 four feet, of which three feet is pavement." That's it.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I like it.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. If you say "four feet, of  
15 which three feet is pavement," that achieves objective.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Municipal engineers,  
17 what do you think?

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: I think, in essence, that's what  
19 you're trying to say.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: That's --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's very similar.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: I don't want it to be narrower than  
24 four feet. In any case, I want you to have a minimum of three  
25 feet of pavement. That's -- I think that's the objective now.



1 Mr. Jones?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: But with the gutter  
3 shouldn't it be five feet?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's --

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: I will (inaudible) to that.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's the question.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: But if your gutter -- if your --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Because then with the gutter  
9 a bicyclist is actually getting less room because they would  
10 only be getting three feet of asphalt, but without a gutter  
11 they would be getting four feet of asphalt.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: No. Under no condition it can be  
13 narrower than four feet.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: The bike lane?

15 MR. BEEBER: The bike lane, under no condition.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I know. But right -- today  
17 it can't be less than five feet with the gutter.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: No, that's not right. It's with the  
19 gutter. But if you say no less than four feet -- you can keep  
20 the language the way it is. I'm perfectly comfortable with the  
21 language that you have here.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think what -- what --  
23 if I hear Bryan correctly what he's saying is that he likes the  
24 current figure and language that if there's a gutter it should  
25 be five total feet, not four as a minimum. Am I hearing you

1 correctly?

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: If you're looking for alternate  
3 language, that's all I suggested. But the language that you  
4 have here in front of you in the agenda, that pretty much says  
5 it. And so I'm okay with it. It says that it's four feet  
6 minimum but it has to be three feet pavement if you have a  
7 gutter. That's very clear.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: There are some agencies  
9 around here that have 18-inch gutters.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. If they have an 18-inch  
11 gutter --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Which means you would wind  
13 up with a four-and-a-half foot bike lane.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right. Yeah.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: On the other hand, if you  
16 have two-and-a-half foot gutter you would wind up with a six-  
17 foot bike lane. So --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Let's actually go back  
19 to the -- begin with the end in mind here. What is the end in  
20 mind? The end that we want is if there's no gutter the minimum  
21 shall be four; right?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Right.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And in the case of  
24 gutter, regardless of the gutter pan width what's our desired  
25 bike lane width, minimum?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Minimum three feet. So I  
2 think language clarifies that.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No, no, no. No,  
4 Devinder, I'm not talking about the pavement. I'm talking  
5 about the total width from the bike lane stripe to base of curb  
6 in that case. The figure has always made that five feet as a  
7 minimum. Now, the way this is thought of bicyclists is you --  
8 your handlebar hangs into the gutter, even though your tire is  
9 tracking on the pavement. So it's okay that it's three feet  
10 rideable asphalt because you've got an effective slightly wider  
11 traveling surface, unlike a car which, you know, a car -- a  
12 car's right tire, that's it. A car doesn't typically overhang  
13 very much outside the -- the wheel well.

14 So what's our desired number for face of curb? Is it  
15 five feet total with gutter or four feet total with gutter?  
16 Because we can -- we can make the language to support it.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Well, you know, at the  
18 beginning we said it's okay, no changes, looks simple, add the  
19 changes are OK. But now we've spent almost half-an-hour  
20 discussing it.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Just to me we're not really  
22 making any change. We're just clarifying. So -- but maybe I  
23 don't see something that others see here. And to me it's  
24 always been four feet. And if they -- if you have a gutter you  
25 can't count the gutter as part of your pavement. You have to

1 have a minimum of three feet. That's what -- that's the way  
2 I've always thought bike lanes are designed. So --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: I guess, you know --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: The problem is, is how  
5 they're implemented is they measure from the face of curb. And  
6 so when you talk to the stripers out on the roadway they  
7 measure from the face of curb. They don't measure from the  
8 edge of the -- edge of the gutter.

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. But you can make it clearer  
10 if you clarify that if there's a gutter you need a minimum of  
11 three feet of pavement, which the language is doing here --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- then they can measure from the  
14 edge of the -- from the face of the curb, but then they know  
15 that they need to have a minimum of three feet of gutter -- I  
16 mean, pavement.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Pavement of three feet.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: So regardless of the width of the  
19 gutter you get your pavement. And a typical gutter is either  
20 18 or 24 inches, so --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. Okay.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. Well, to take  
23 this forward I need to make sure that we're doing the right  
24 language. I'm really picking a point here because this is  
25 going to cause implementers to change their behavior. If we

1 implement as written I think that we could see gutters that are  
2 really skinny and the total bike lane width drops to three feet  
3 plus a little bit. I don't like that.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: You're not going to see  
5 skinny gutters. They're going to be -- you can't really form  
6 up anything less than about an 18-inch gutter and pour concrete  
7 and put it in the proper stuff. I mean, it's --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: What do you call the  
9 type of drainage system where you have a continuous -- I call  
10 it a slot drain. It's --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Slotted drain.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's a slotted drain?  
13 Is that a gutter?

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Well, you're -- now you are talking  
15 about the dykes there. Those --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No, I'm not talking  
17 about a dyke. I'm talking about the buried metal pipe that has  
18 a continuous --

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. Okay.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: That is an inlet. It's not  
21 a curb and gutter. A slotted drain, that's a tough one. We  
22 see those around here.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: We probably don't want to have a  
24 bike lane next to them anyways because --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No. Actually --

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- the openings are longitudinal.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No. It's not -- it's  
3 not a longitudinal hazard because they -- a slot is flushed.  
4 Actually, it's a way of getting a bike lane where you otherwise  
5 would find it awkward to get a bike lane because of having to  
6 construct a gutter. It's a good thing if done right. But I'm  
7 trying to assess out whether that constitutes a gutter because  
8 it bears on -- if that's -- if that's a gutter and not an inlet  
9 or something else, then if we just put "or three feet of  
10 pavement if a gutter exists," we could end up having three feet  
11 bike lanes next to slot drains.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: I think if we get to that level of  
13 detail then I share concerns that Mr. Marshall raised, that if  
14 you are doing highway design in California MUTCD, that we are  
15 just giving dimensions. The detailed design work needs to be  
16 done in the Highway Design Manual. I mean, if you want to --  
17 if you want to get into different types of curbs and different  
18 types of drainage systems and all that, those are like highway  
19 design issues. They're not traffic control device issues.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's -- that's -- I  
21 appreciate that we don't want to get into that territory. But  
22 we are, in fact, making a condition on a gutter here.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And that opens it up  
25 for here.

1           If we go back to not doing the edit the outcome is if  
2 there's no gutter we get a four-foot bike lane as the minimum,  
3 hopefully wider. If we -- if a gutter exists we get a five-  
4 foot bike lane, which is like the figure. So --

5           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So you're okay with the  
6 existing language? We -- I don't have any problem going with  
7 the existing language, so --

8           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I do -- the one  
9 exception I've seen is in some cities I see three-foot concrete  
10 gutters. So in that case --

11          COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Text says three feet of  
12 minimum pavement regardless of gutter width.

13          COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: If you make the edit.

14          CHAIR BAHADORI: Even -- even if they have a 12-foot  
15 gutter, the language that we have here still says they have to  
16 have three feet of pavement.

17          COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I hear you.

18          CHAIR BAHADORI: So let's say, so regardless of the  
19 depth of the gutter the three-foot pavement is guaranteed, so  
20 is the minimum four feet --

21          COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

22          CHAIR BAHADORI: -- because they have to meet both  
23 conditions. They have to have minimum four feet with total,  
24 and they have to have minimum three feet of pavement.

25          COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: You say both conditions

1 apply, but I see an "or" before the number five or three. Can  
2 we make that an "and" and I'm good with it?

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah, you can. Yeah. Okay, yeah.  
4 If you are -- take the word "or" out and put in parentheses,  
5 and just say "three feet of pavement if a gutter exists."

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. Then I'd like to  
7 move that -- move adoption of the proposed edit, but with the  
8 change of the word "or" before the number to "and" before the  
9 number. So it would read --

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- "but not less than  
12 four feet, and," let's say, "not less than" --

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- "three feet of  
15 pavement if a gutter exists."

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah, that clarifies. So it says,  
17 "Not less than four feet, and" --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: "And not less" --

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- "two feet of pavement" --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: "And not less than  
21 three feet" --

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- "and not less than three feet  
23 of" --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- "three feet of  
25 pavement if" --



1 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- "of pavement if a gutter exists."  
2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.  
3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'll second that.  
4 CHAIR BAHADORI: So there is a motion and a second.  
5 Any questions or comments on that?  
6 Mr. Marshall.  
7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Thank you. Could I  
8 suggest maybe the word "with" instead of "and"? And confuses  
9 me a little. So it would say, "four feet with not less than  
10 three feet of pavement."  
11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: As long as -- as long  
12 as "not less than" appears, yes. I'm sorry. I accept the  
13 friendly amendment, provided that the insertion of "not less  
14 than" --  
15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes.  
16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes. Thank you.  
17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. So what's the final pleasure,  
18 "and" or "with"?  
19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: With.  
20 CHAIR BAHADORI: With? With? You're okay?  
21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: With.  
22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So it's going to read, "not  
23 less -- but not less than four feet, with at a minimum three  
24 feet of pavement if a gutter exists?"  
25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: "Not less than."

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: "Not less than three feet -- not  
2 less than" -- is that okay, everyone?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: So that's the motion and there's a  
5 second on that. Any comments, questions? Any member of the  
6 audience?

7 Mr. Royer.

8 MR. ROYER: First, I really concur with that three-  
9 foot requirement.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Dave, could you please introduce  
11 yourself for the court reporter?

12 MR. ROYER: Oh. Dave Royer, Engineering Consultant.  
13 I certainly agree with that three-foot clearance because of the  
14 side-opening inlet drainage systems. We have to -- the -- when  
15 you go three to four feet out, not the two-foot, so the two-  
16 foot gutter goes out at least three feet. If you're on a  
17 hillside you go out four feet. And that concrete drain has a  
18 severe warp in it to drop the water into that side-opening  
19 inlet. And that -- that is not -- it's not negotiable -- well,  
20 not negotiable. You can not navigate that on a bicycle because  
21 of the extreme warp that the gutter actually places.

22 Also, the main thing I wanted to comment on, and I --  
23 the diagrams that are shown in -- is that Chapter 100 of the  
24 Highway Design Manual --

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: 300.

1           MR. ROYER:  -- 300 of the Highway Design Manual, that  
2 is actually mandated by the Streets and Highways Code in  
3 California.  That's the only chapter that's a requirement in  
4 the State of California, so --

5           CHAIR BAHADORI:  I thought it was Chapter 1000.

6           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH:  Chapter 1000.

7           MR. ROYER:  Or 1000.

8           CHAIR BAHADORI:  Yeah.  I thought Chapter 1000 was --

9           MR. ROYER:  1000.

10          CHAIR BAHADORI:  -- mandated in --

11          MR. ROYER:  Yeah.  Because that way that diagram is  
12 out of --

13          CHAIR BAHADORI:  -- the Street Highway Code 300  
14 (inaudible).

15          MR. ROYER:  Yeah.  That -- that -- that mandates it  
16 per the Streets and Highways Code.

17          CHAIR BAHADORI:  Well, I think this figure is in  
18 Chapter 300.  It's not in 1000.

19          MR. ROYER:  Oh.  Oh, okay.  Just have to make sure  
20 that you don't -- that the MUTCD follows that Chapter 1000 --

21          CHAIR BAHADORI:  Yeah.

22          MR. ROYER:  -- because that Chapter is mandated by  
23 the Streets and Highways Code.

24          CHAIR BAHADORI:  Thank you.

25          MR. ROYER:  That's it.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. You've heard Mr. Royer's  
2 comments. Okay. All those in favor of the motion -- any more  
3 discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all those in favor?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: I have to ask another  
5 questions. A high speed inlet where the --

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: -- where it suddenly jumps  
8 out to four feet in width, how are we going to handle that with  
9 a three-foot minimum pavement? Are we -- are we to adjust the  
10 curb line?

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Well, there -- there it goes.  
12 That's why Dave brought it up. And that's why I don't like to  
13 get into highway design in California MUTCD.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: When I was in --

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: This is highway design.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: When I was in Carlsbad we  
17 started taking those out and just replacing the concrete that  
18 went out there with asphalt and the water still floated the --  
19 to the drain inlet, and we did a whole experiment with them.  
20 And there was no mathematical storm drain calculations to  
21 justify that concrete going out there. It was just something  
22 that we've always done that way. And so we just -- we just saw  
23 cut that part that went out there and replaced it with asphalt,  
24 and stormwater still went into the drain, just like it always  
25 had.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: But there is still a lot of those  
2 high-flow inlets --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- all over California.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: That's what we used to do in at  
7 least one -- I did them in the early '80s. That's how we did  
8 them.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: So -- yeah.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. It was just a  
12 standard that people applied with that because bike lanes  
13 weren't considered when they were designed.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Right. So anyway, you keep that in  
15 mind then. And with that, there is a motion and there is a  
16 second. And these are like very fine points that some attorney  
17 is going to be discussing someday, that what was that gutter  
18 width at that point and why didn't you maintain three-foot  
19 minimum pavement at that location. Okay. Okay. Last comment,  
20 because I already asked.

21 MS. CUTHBERT: Muna Cuthbert, City of Chula Vista. I  
22 agree with Mike. Technically then the lane would be so wide  
23 we -- maybe we don't even have enough right-of-way to add a  
24 bike lane with -- with the travel lane. So we need to be  
25 careful with that. So maybe next to that, I agree, maybe you

1 can change it. But sometimes it's not that easy to do in the  
2 codes and all this stuff. So thank you.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you for your comment. I think  
4 the issue is clear for all the members. So we'll just go with  
5 the language that we're introducing here, the high-flow inlets  
6 will not comply if you maintain the same bike lane width. You  
7 have to go out. You have to kind of do a zigzag around it to  
8 maintain the minimum three feet. Okay. But we have had this  
9 healthy discussion, and there is a motion and there is a  
10 second. All those in favor -- well, let's do it by count  
11 because probably it's going to be a split. All those who  
12 support the motion, raise your hand. One, two, three, four,  
13 five, six. Okay. I have to vote. Opposed. So it's nine to  
14 one. The motion passes. Okay.

15 Next one?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Three opposed?

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: One opposed, because I still think  
18 it's a highway design issue. It shouldn't be --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay. So next, page 39, we  
20 have decided, if you look we are adding asterisk at bike symbol  
21 and putting underneath, "Required at far side of intersection,  
22 other use is optional elsewhere." So after intersection you  
23 need an arrow up, either bike lane or bike symbol -- bike  
24 symbol. So that's the only changes.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Any questions or comments on

1 this proposed change?

2 Mr. Greenwood.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Is this trying to -- is  
4 this trying to say that you have to put the bike symbol after  
5 every intersection?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: It is required, yes. If you  
7 have bike lane, I think there's a section after intersection.  
8 Either you have to put a bike lane with arrow or symbol with  
9 arrow. After that, if your block is like less than two mile,  
10 repetition is optional. But after intersections it is  
11 required.

12 John, you can correct me.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have -- sorry, I'd  
14 have to go back and reference that. I was focusing on the  
15 figure. That's -- the intention here is to make it more  
16 optional, so you have to apply the less. But you still have to  
17 do it after each intersection to warn the people that have  
18 entered that intersection that there's a bike lane.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: So in an urban setting  
20 we would have to put this marking every 330 feet?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I'm looking at a section,  
22 Section 9C.04 talks about -- so that's the same section that  
23 we -- which we discussed this California language. So it's  
24 9C.04. So if you look at paragraph 39 it says, "Bike lane  
25 permanent markings shall be placed on the far side of

1 intersection." Page 38 of the agenda, paragraph 39.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's -- that's been  
3 my understanding as a practitioner.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So if you really of 300 feet  
5 apart intersections, so you are required to put it after each  
6 intersection?

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: I, mean in urban settings as in  
8 downtown areas, we have them like every 300 feet.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And again --

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: That's always --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- the intention is to  
12 inform the traveling public, including the enforcement  
13 community, that that is a bike lane. Otherwise how do you --  
14 you know, it's a separate issue of the sign, but that's --  
15 that's a separate issue.

16 I did have a clarification question about the  
17 proposal though. I see the introduction of the asterisks on  
18 Subfigure A above the bike symbol and Subfigure B above the  
19 helmet bicycle symbol. But I don't see an asterisk near the  
20 word marking "Bike Lane." Was it the intention to have those  
21 be optional as well?

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Any further discussion on this or  
23 answering questions that John asked? Johnny, you're looking it  
24 up? Johnny, do you have any --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I leave up to your



1 expertise. Yes, it should be same, I think as on the bikes  
2 too.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes, so it should be. So  
5 we'll correct that figure and we'll just add asterisk on the  
6 top of the bike pavement amrking too.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So bottom line, the  
8 proposal here is clarifying the practitioners that are looking  
9 at the figure that the mandatory element is the stripe, must  
10 always be present, but the markings need only be applied at the  
11 far side of intersections?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Correct. And let's see,  
13 like I said, if your block is 1000 feet you don't need to put a  
14 bike lane or bike symbol to reinforce bike lane, but it's  
15 required after each intersections.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Well, isn't this Figure 9C-  
17 3, isn't it saying the arrow is optional, not the legend?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It currently says the  
19 arrow is optional, because that's the existing asterisk.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: That's the existing. We are  
21 crossing out existing.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. The asterisk is going to come  
23 out.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I know. So you're -- so  
25 you're saying the arrow is no longer optional and the arrow and

1 either the legend or the words have to be put in. Because the  
2 text already says that that has to be at the far side of an  
3 intersection.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Correct.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And this figure with the  
6 asterisk was not for the entire thing but just for the arrow,  
7 wasn't it?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: If you look at the next  
9 paragraph, 40, "The bike lane pavement marking may also be  
10 placed" -- okay, no. No. That's not -- so arrow could be. I  
11 don't know.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: See optional word 42, "arrow  
13 and symbol markings with details as shown in Figure 9C-3 may be  
14 used. So line 42 is saying that the arrow is optional.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Correct. So --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And so now we're saying that  
17 the arrow is not optional.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: No.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: No. It should -- it's  
20 mislabeled, so we'll make that correction too. So arrow is  
21 optional. Bike symbol or bike lane is required.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So we'll need one -- the  
2 arrows with a double asterisk and the -- the legend or the  
3 words with a single asterisk?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Correct. So arrow will be  
5 optional, and the bike symbol or bike lane is required. So  
6 we'll make two changes, one asterisks but arrow with the two.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: We'll make that correction.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. Thanks for that  
10 clarification because I didn't realize that that nuance was in  
11 there.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: The arrow is just to help  
14 the -- the bicyclist know which direction they're supposed to  
15 be traveling in that bike lane.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Correct.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So, Devinder, the  
18 intent here is to make it clear that the bike or helmet and  
19 bike or the words "Bike Lane" is optional, except on the far  
20 side of every intersection?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Correct. Correct.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And the arrow is  
23 optional regardless?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. And that will be

1 done with a system of one and two asterisks?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. Thank you.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So everyone clear on what the  
5 final proposed changes are? Okay. Any members of the audience  
6 wish to speak?

7 Mr. Bhullar.

8 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. I can  
9 not comment on the issue here, but I just have a question,  
10 probably for all of us. Why do we have three illustrations of  
11 this type of marking? We have a word message, we have a symbol  
12 with a helmet, and then we have just a bicycle. Wouldn't it be  
13 easier just to have one probably? Why do we have three? I  
14 mean, the feds provide us with three but we don't have to keep  
15 all three. So isn't there, like just for signs, like we always  
16 say symbol is better than word, or somehow we want to show our  
17 preference here?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: The text is narrower. And  
19 I know when you have a really narrow bike lane sometimes the  
20 text works, but the other two look nicer but they're wider.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Then helmet or bike?

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: This is a different option. So I  
23 think -- I think we've just been doing this. So people have  
24 them and they want to keep them. They don't want to change  
25 them.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: It's the way we've always  
2 done it.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: All right. You're supposed not to  
4 say that.

5 Mr. Morrissey?

6 MR. MORRISSEY: Hi. Sam Morrissey, City of Santa  
7 Monica. I just want to say, I do support this suggestion.  
8 It's definitely what we've been doing in practice, and I think  
9 this really clarifies it for a lot of practitioners. I don't  
10 know if this warrants maybe further discussion on a later date,  
11 but I know in our urban settings we found that it's very  
12 helpful as our bike lanes get wider and wider to put even more  
13 of these symbols any place there's an alley intersection or a  
14 driveway. And I'm not sure if it would be even more helpful to  
15 practitioners to be aware of that. We've run into vehicles not  
16 understanding that this wider lane is only for bikes. So maybe  
17 at a later date you'd want to discuss that.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Good comments. Thank you. Seeing  
19 nobody else in the audience, bringing it back, okay, what's the  
20 pleasure?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Move approval of the  
22 proposal as clarified by Devinder that I will clearly indicate  
23 that the arrow is optional in any case, and the remaining  
24 markings, the iconic markings or the word markings are optional  
25 except they are still required after every intersection.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: At the far side.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And that the -- the  
3 line, which is labeled in the figure as a normal white lane, is  
4 required regardless.

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a motion. Is there a  
6 second?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.

8 There's a motion and a second. Any discussion?

9 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing none, the motion  
11 passes. The changes as discussed are recommended.

12 The last one.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: The last one, Mr. Chair,  
14 page 40, we are clarifying -- if you look at the bottom of the  
15 figure, the existing is two-foot line, six feet space -- six-  
16 foot space, that is around, basically, according to detail 39  
17 it should be four-foot line and eight-foot space. So we're  
18 just making that correction.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So it's more editorial in  
20 nature?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: So I don't think there is a motion  
23 to approve the change. Is there a second?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion and a second.

1 Discussion? All those in favor say aye.

2 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing none the motion  
4 passes unanimously. That change is recommended. Also, we are  
5 done with the bicycle changes, Chapter 9.

6 Let's go to item 14-12, proposal to amend Section  
7 9C.07, which is the shared lane marking.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Mr. Chairman, this is  
9 also -- the changes that are recommended to California  
10 language, CBAC, California Bicycle Advisory Committee, wrote  
11 email to me asking that this -- when we adopted this language  
12 we included all shared used paths. And their comments was they  
13 do not use, shared-use path. And they requested to remove that  
14 language. Then the other change "automobiles" to "motor  
15 Vehicle", if you look at the section above they call it "motor  
16 vehicles," so I want to be consistent. If you look at section  
17 B in the same -- I'm sorry, paragraph B, it says "motor  
18 vehicles." So I just want to be consistent. Instead of  
19 "automobiles" I said "motor vehicles."

20 If you want to hear the background, why they want to  
21 remove -- are requesting to remove all shared-use paths, I will  
22 ask, John, if you have any input on that?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. The issue here  
24 is that the optional paragraph 02-A is establishing where the  
25 shared lane marking may be placed on roadways. And the

1 conditions that it sets forth are twofold -- threefold,  
2 actually, where there is bicycle travel, of course, "Where  
3 there is no marked bicycle lane and," as written, "or shared-  
4 use path and the right-hand traffic lane is too narrow to allow  
5 motor vehicles to safely pass bicyclists." That's the key  
6 thing here, it's a narrow lane that you want to indicate to the  
7 traveling public that bicycles will be occupying the lane and  
8 that they have a right -- a right to do that.

9           The issue is the shared-use path. Bicyclists are not  
10 required in I think 49 states, including California, to use a  
11 shared-use path if provided. They have a choice to remain on  
12 the roadway. They are also always compelling reasons to do so.  
13 Sometimes you don't know, if it's your first time there, where  
14 the path goes or what its condition is. So allowing or  
15 basically on a street where there is no marked bike lane but  
16 there is a shared-use path, having the shared-use path phrase  
17 in there would allow -- would leave practitioners to conclude  
18 that the shared lane marking may not be placed on that street,  
19 and that's incorrect.

20           So it's misleading to practitioners to leave it in  
21 and that's why it should be struck.

22           CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Any questions or comments on  
23 this proposed edit? Any member of -- yes, Mona?

24           MS. CUTHBERT: Mona Cuthbert, City of Chula Vista.  
25 The shared lane, now we're talking about route, bike route,



1 sometimes we put the sign, sometimes we don't. So I'm kind of  
2 confused at quote "shared lane marking." And I think if we  
3 want to add it with the route so we have the route and maybe  
4 the sign said "bicycle may use -- may use full lane" -- or I  
5 forgot the name exactly on the sign. But sometimes I don't  
6 want to put it because if the road is too narrow then the  
7 bicycles go in the front and the cars behind try to pass them  
8 and can not or, you know, they share and so they are next to  
9 each other and watch for each other. So kind of that's -- I  
10 think maybe we need to give it more attention and maybe more  
11 guidance on that. Thank you.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. John, you want to say  
13 something?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm not sure I  
15 understand the -- the particular concern of the practitioner  
16 from Chula Vista. Could you come up again? So are you  
17 speaking to reluctance to apply the shared lane marking or one  
18 of the other signs.

19 MS. CUTHBERT: Because normally we don't have a  
20 marking on the road to say shared lane. We don't have. So if  
21 I put the sharrow, and in some cases what I do, I'll put the  
22 sharrow but I don't put the sign that bicycles may use full  
23 lane because I don't want to have the bicycle going in the  
24 front taking his time, maybe 20 miles per hour, 30 miles per  
25 hour if he can, and some they can't. So the car goes behind.

1           So I'm just trying to protect the bicyclist that  
2 don't feel like they have the right to have full lane and the  
3 car behind, but at the same time I'm trying to put the sharrow  
4 marking so this way the cars or vehicle they know, okay, most  
5 likely the bicycle will be somewhere around where I'm driving.  
6 But I don't put the sign saying "The bicycle may use full  
7 lane." So this is how I look at it from my judgment instead  
8 of -- that it is a bike route, really. So it's a bike route,  
9 and the sharrow, they don't match, both of them two different  
10 application almost. Because from here you are saying it's a  
11 bike route, so the car and the vehicle share. And from here  
12 we're saying, oh, you can't use the whole lane and the sharrow  
13 to replace it. So we're using like two different messages, the  
14 way I see it.

15           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Thank you.

16           MS. CUTHBERT: Thanks.

17           CHAIR BAHADORI: Do you want to address that or just  
18 receive the comments?

19           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Just receive the  
20 comments.

21           CHAIR BAHADORI: Just receive the comments. Thank  
22 you. Okay.

23           Any discussion? Seeing none, is there a motion to  
24 approve?

25           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Motion to approve.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a motion and a second. Any  
3 comments? All those in favor say aye.

4 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing none, the motion  
6 passes. The change is recommended.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: One final comment on  
8 this --

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: Sure.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- particular topic. I  
11 wanted to inform the Committee and the attendees that the  
12 second edition of the IT Traffic Control Devices Handbook has a  
13 substantially rewritten bicycle facilities chapter, Chapter 14.  
14 And I co-wrote it with Richard Moore, who is the Chair of the  
15 National Bicycle Advisory Committee, the (inaudible) committee.  
16 It goes into much more detail on placement of shared lane  
17 markings.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: What's in the MUTCD,  
20 both federal and California right now, is very minimal, right-  
21 side minimum type of guidance. But we feel that practitioners  
22 should basically center the marking within the travel area if  
23 the lane is too narrow to share, for a number of reasons. You  
24 can't express that with a pure right-side minimum. So the  
25 Traffic Control Devices Handbook chapter now makes the

1 distinction between an effective lane width that's too narrow  
2 to share and one that's not too narrow to share, that is wide  
3 enough for motor vehicles to pass smoothly within the lane.  
4 And in the case where it's too narrow to share it recommends  
5 the placement of the marking is centered in the effective lane,  
6 which is the -- in the case of parking it's the full width  
7 minus the parking minus the door zone.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So I refer people to  
10 chapter 14 of the new TCDH.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Good comments for those who do these  
12 for design work, go back to the IT Manual also. Okay.

13 We have now item 14-15, proposal to amend section  
14 Section 6F.87, rumble strips in the construction zone --  
15 traffic control zone. Go ahead.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Mr. Chairman, this item was  
17 placed on the agenda by our branch. And this was developed as  
18 a discussion of Caltrans internal committee, but as suggested  
19 it's needed by construction during flagging operations,  
20 basically. You know, we -- we are proposing portable rumble  
21 strip in front of the flagger stations. And I will ask Johnny  
22 to address this item.

23 MR. BHULLAR: All right. Johnny Bhullar with  
24 Caltrans. As per the agenda, if you go to, I believe, page 47  
25 of the amended and -- page 47 of 69, I did lay out the

1 background here as information. But in a nutshell I will just  
2 briefly touch on it.

3           Basically, what happened is a couple of years back,  
4 or actually a little bit more than two years, we had three  
5 fatalities on Caltrans -- with Caltrans workers in the matter  
6 of a couple of months. And as a result all of a sudden we had  
7 stand-down and we created -- you know, construction and  
8 Caltrans created a group of Caltrans as well as the industry  
9 folks together to come up with ideas and just brainstorm as to  
10 what can we do differently or more to improve safety of our  
11 workers because of the fatalities that happen.

12           So as a result there was a brainstorming. And out of  
13 that there were a number of ideas that came up, but there were  
14 12 that were identified and agreed upon that we were going to  
15 work. Out of those 12 there are -- this one happens to be one  
16 of those. And in this case Caltrans continues to have issues  
17 with flaggers and our flaggers getting injuries. Even if it's  
18 not a fatal, not a few months go by that we don't have either a  
19 secondary collision or a worker or flagger getting injured in  
20 the process. So as a result, once we have this from the  
21 MUTCD -- right now the MUTCD does recognize this to be a  
22 device, however, there is no criteria.

23           So the item that was agreed upon by the task force at  
24 that time was that using the portable transverse rumble strip  
25 in a very narrow situation which is in advance of a flagger,

1 and in order for us to do that we started and experiment. So  
2 Caltrans experimented, mainly in the north region, but also in  
3 the San Luis Obispo are a number of projects. And we tried  
4 different products. And when we tried different products what  
5 we found out was that some work, of course, and some don't.  
6 And in one case when we were experimenting one of the products,  
7 RoadQuake 2, that is portable, no adhesive. The flagger, only  
8 when they are live and they are in the roadway and they will be  
9 flagging an operation, then they go out and place these devices  
10 out in the field, no adhesive, just laid out. And then  
11 vehicles and trucks go over it, and we have tried it, and there  
12 is hardly any movement. So it has proven to be super  
13 successful.

14           So what we are proposing here is we are working on  
15 two or three things related to just this one device. Currently  
16 the California MUTCD or National MUTCD recognizes this to be  
17 just a device and doesn't go into details. What we are working  
18 on is trying to amend the policy here in the manual to -- for  
19 the narrow situation of advance of flaggers, how do you go  
20 about placing it, how many areas, what locations, how do they  
21 work with advance warning sign package that we currently have?  
22 And also we are working on a standard plan T sheet (phonetic),  
23 a current one, just revising it to show the depiction of these  
24 arrays of the portable transverse rumble strip in the roadway  
25 in connection with the signs. And the thing, at least in-

1 house, we are working on is like the specifications that can go  
2 along with it so that the materials or the products can be  
3 qualified within that. But here I'm just talking one item.

4 But this is something that is quite important for us.  
5 And the construction, for a couple of years we have been  
6 working experimenting. Everything has so far checked out. We  
7 have worked with CHP at the -- at the academy by running  
8 motorcycles back and forth. So we have done quite a lot. I  
9 won't go into all those details. I'll let -- in case the  
10 questions come up, then I'll touch on them. But what -- what  
11 I'm going to touch on is just the portions of the manual of  
12 what we are proposing.

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: Well, let me start asking questions.  
14 The language that I --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Answer.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Is this the latest?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I'm sorry. The Members are  
18 looking for the revised text in the agenda package. I put one  
19 handout, separate set on the table. We made some minor changes,  
20 what is shown in the agenda packet.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So look at the package.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Look at the sheet that's in front of  
24 you --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yed.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- that says Section 6F.87, Rumble  
2 Strips, on top.

3 Johnny, this seems to me like you took this right out  
4 of some manufacturer's spec. What -- I mean, what is the --  
5 where did these numbers come from? I mean, you're so specific.  
6 You say, "5/8 to 3/4 inch including the height of adhesive, not  
7 less than 12 inches, not wider than 13 inches." Is this just  
8 the manufacturer's spec because this is the guy you guys used,  
9 or where did they come from?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Can I answer?

11 MR. BHULLAR: All right.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Can I answer about the 5/8  
13 to 3/4?

14 MR. BHULLAR: Ok, let --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: The pavement markers height  
16 is maximum 3/4 inch. It's not more than 3/4 of an inch, so  
17 maybe that's reason to keep height between 5/8 to 3/4.

18 MR. BHULLAR: All right. Now let me tough on a  
19 little bit of detail since the question has come up.  
20 Basically, what happened is that we experimented with certain  
21 devices and some were working, some were not. But at that time  
22 I was asked to create or draft or a spec, as well as a policy  
23 to go along with this. But I shied away from it because when I  
24 looked at it at the national level there is a lot of other  
25 states that are working on and trying out different things, so



1 there was no consensus. And having worked with FHWA, as well  
2 as ETSA (phonetic), I became aware of -- that there is a  
3 research report that we are working on . And I said until I  
4 have some national consensus on this I am not going to be  
5 making policies just on my own.

6           So based on that I did not want to go with just the  
7 manufacturer's spec on this, so I waited. And last September  
8 there was a report that came out and that's the copies that are  
9 being handed out right now, if you want to look at it. Since  
10 September of last year FHWA and ETSA jointly issued a report  
11 that you have in front of you, and that actually looks at and  
12 embraces all the states and the different ways of doing it,  
13 because this is not just in advance of flaggers. You can use  
14 it slow down traffic in a construction zone, a number of ways  
15 of doing it. And also if you look at either Oregon DOT or  
16 Kansas, as well as Texas, they're using it for different  
17 applications, either in work zones or even otherwise.

18           So what I tried to do was base my policy spec on this  
19 report because it's based on, effectively, an ETSA, so it's a  
20 wider acceptance of that. So I'm trying to remain within the  
21 tolerances. So all my details are from this publication.

22           CHAIR BAHADORI: There is one -- one other question I  
23 have is on the last requirement, that you are actually putting  
24 it still under the options. You're -- you're asking that if  
25 these things go out of alignment, they askew by more than six

1 inches, that they should be adjusted. So if you are -- I mean,  
2 just -- where does the six inch come from and how often do they  
3 need to be adjusted?

4 MR. BHULLAR: All right. The way it worked, at least  
5 on some products, was that the couple of products we tried,  
6 they were moving in a matter of, I would say once the trucks  
7 were going over, in a matter of maybe even under an hour. But  
8 in other case we were having -- the ones that we successfully  
9 tested, that they would not even move by two inches after three  
10 days, four days of trucks going over it. So we just tried to  
11 put something in there so that at least it does close the loop  
12 on in case there is movement. But in our case we were using it  
13 only when the flagger is there. So the flagger is not -- if  
14 there is no flagging operation, then these will be picked up  
15 within 15 minutes of a flagger -- flagging operation being  
16 there or not. So these are not going to be remaining overnight  
17 or even for longer durations.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: So they're -- they're only --

19 MR. BHULLAR: But I'm trying to close the loop --  
20 loop on that.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: They're only if the flagger is  
22 there?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Correct.

24 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Only in advance of flaggers, and  
25 only when the flagging operation is there.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Let's see, Members,  
2 questions, comments on this?

3 MR. BHULLAR: And also I would like to point out that  
4 the one-page handout was a minor revision to the proposal that  
5 I originally had on the CTCDC agenda as per Kevin Gold  
6 (inaudible) California Division of Construction indicate that I  
7 had taken probably a little bit too -- too much liberty by  
8 extending it. I had -- the way I had done it I was extending  
9 these type of -- these policies now to portable and not just  
10 flaggers but also the portable, meaning fixed adhesive or  
11 without adhesive. So trying to clarify and trying to remain  
12 within my rules of just using a portable without an adhesive in  
13 advance of a flagger, I've amended it accordingly. And I think  
14 he's satisfied.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Any other questions from  
16 Members? One -- one question. Sorry, Dave.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Johnny, I know we had  
18 concerns at the academy when we tested it about the motorcycles  
19 going over it and their tires actually leaving the ground. Is  
20 there any recommendation on this on what speeds these can be  
21 used at?

22 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Right now I'm going to  
23 probably -- this would be a good time for me to, first of all,  
24 stop and let some of the representatives -- because I work on  
25 the technical portion. But this came from (inaudible) Area 14,

1 as well as our Division of Construction. So I would like a  
2 couple of first speakers come in and at least -- if now is the  
3 time -- to just talk about the background. And they have some  
4 of the details that I don't on that question --

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Now I hope that that --

6 MR. BHULLAR: -- because I can not answer that  
7 question.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: I hope that question is answered.  
9 Also, one last, before you leave, the samples you are showing  
10 us, it has a white in it also. But you're saying only use  
11 orange or black. Is there a reason white was left out?

12 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. The reason why white is out is  
13 white has a specific meaning in the California Vehicle Code  
14 when you use it as -- when you use it in the lane. For that  
15 reason we don't want to have it confused. Initially we were  
16 trying to look at if you wanted to mark it, where the flagger  
17 is there at the limit line, but -- but sometimes it's in place,  
18 sometimes it's not, so we don't want to do that.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So who do you have to speak?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: If I may, probably --

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: No, Johnny, yeah, stay there.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Just one quick question.  
23 I want to clarify that the use of rumble strips is optional in  
24 a work zone.

25 MR. BHULLAR: That's correct.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: This policy doesn't say  
2 that.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: I think what --

4 MR. BHULLAR: Well, let me look into --

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: I think what Mr. Greenwood is saying  
6 is that the whole thing is optional.

7 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, I agree. And I'm trying to read  
8 the --

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: There is no standard.

10 MR. BHULLAR: -- read the language in general,  
11 because I was only touching on the portion that talks about the  
12 portable transverse portion in advance of flaggers. But let me  
13 see the -- where -- the main policy regarding the rumble strip  
14 itself.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: As long as make sure that these are  
16 just optional devices, that people don't have to use them.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, the "can be used" is the support  
18 statement.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: If you want to look at -- if you  
20 want to --

21 MR. BHULLAR: So in that --

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: If you have someone else to talk  
23 technical stuff --

24 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- you can come back to that.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Let me look into it.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: Look it up please and answer Mr.  
3 Greenwood's question.

4 Who else is speaking on this?

5 MR. WONG: This is -- my name is Gordon and I work  
6 for Caltrans. I used to be the Part 6 support on the  
7 California MUTCD. I'm now the maintenance safety engineer.  
8 And the rumble strip was one of my safety pilot projects.

9 Let me answer the first question about the  
10 dimensioning. The -- we have transverse rumble strips first  
11 installed on Bay Bridge and they worked great, approached the  
12 Bay Bridge S curve that's no longer there because the new  
13 bridge is already opened. But when they were put in on the old  
14 bridge S curve they worked wonderful.

15 The -- the height of the -- the rumble strip was at  
16 least 5/8. And the top -- the maximum height of 3/4 of an inch  
17 was a suggestion from me to the manufacturer. And their first  
18 version was 15/16 of an inch tall. And in the Highway Design  
19 Manual for California we had a table in there that determined  
20 for bicycles, a bicycle can safely transverse a vertical  
21 elevation differential of 3/4 of an inch, and that was done by  
22 a university study. So by limiting the rumble strip to be  
23 under 3/4 of an inch is to ensure bicycles can transverse  
24 without disrupting the bicyclists from passing through.

25 And the weight of 105 pounds is one thing that's

1 stated in the -- in the federal report. The second thing is we  
2 had tested some units that's lighter in work, and they just  
3 won't stay put. And that's we've -- I feel it's important to  
4 have a minimum weight to be put in the manual because the --  
5 the lighter weight unit, when cars ran over it, it would move  
6 sometimes up to six inches.

7           And for the question of the -- Lieutenant Dave as you  
8 were asking about the speed limit, we're using it for a  
9 flagging operation. And all the flagging operations are  
10 usually done on two-lane highways. And all the California two-  
11 lane highways are maximum sign speed is 65 miles per hour.  
12 Only freeways go up to 70. So -- and we have tested the unit  
13 also on major highways with much higher speed for the traffic  
14 to pass through than they were determined to be safe and do not  
15 move, up to 70 or 75 miles an hour. So we're very comfortable  
16 to use them for flagging operation at maximum speed of 65 miles  
17 per hour.

18           And we -- we have lots of successful stories with  
19 them already in the field based on federal guidelines. And  
20 there was a fatality accident on Interstate 5. It was three  
21 fatalities over one weekend. And one of them was on the  
22 Caltrans maintenance work zone, and the other two was on the  
23 contractor work zone. And both are rear-ending accidents  
24 because they -- they were approaching the flagging station too  
25 fast and didn't stop in time and then rear-ended the vehicles

1 already parked there. And right after that we deployed one set  
2 for the contractors work zone and one set for the Caltrans work  
3 zone, and for the rest of two months there was no more rear-  
4 ending accidents. And so they were tested very successfully in  
5 the field.

6           And we just -- one problem we encountered is that  
7 we -- we were testing it using a bump sign because the bump  
8 sign is the only thing I can find in the California MUTCD  
9 that's closest to the rumble strip sign. So just for  
10 experimental purposes we used the bump sign. And the problem  
11 with that is we -- we collect data from the drive when the  
12 driver passed through the rumble strip, then stopped at the  
13 flagging stations. And then we asked them, what do they think?  
14 One of the biggest problems is that it's -- they -- they don't  
15 understand what bump sign means, and they don't understand --  
16 they don't know if that device was placed there on purpose.  
17 They thought it was a tire tread in the -- in the road, so they  
18 actually tried to drive around it and causing a hazard. So we  
19 talked to Johnny and asked to create a rumble strip sign. And  
20 I think that would resolve that situation.

21           That's -- and that's pretty much the gist of it.  
22 Thank you.

23           CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Next please. Oh, before  
24 you leave, Gordon, do you have any questions for Gordon? Okay.  
25 Thank you.



1           MR. JEFFREY: My name is Joe Jeffrey. I've got a  
2 company called Road-Tech Safety Services up in the Sacramento  
3 area. I'm also the co-chair of California's Strategic Highway  
4 Safety Plan Work Zone Challenge Area Committee. We've been  
5 working on this rumble strip project for quite a while now.

6           I was excited about it right from the beginning  
7 because I can see such value for my crews out in the field. We  
8 do a lot of work up in rural counties where you have a lot of  
9 line of sight issues and that sort of thing. And I can't tell  
10 you how many times we've had people locking up all four wheels  
11 coming into our -- our closures.

12           Twenty-six percent of all work zone fatalities are as  
13 a result of end-of-queue crashes. And I really believe that --  
14 that having these rumble strips out there will make a huge  
15 difference and reduce -- I think it could probably reduce, at  
16 least in terms of flagging operations, probably reduce  
17 something like 95 percent of those, just because people are  
18 driving by our signs, they're driving by changeable message  
19 signs. They're not paying attention, not looking up. We  
20 believe that when they -- they roll over these rumble strips  
21 they are going to be paying attention to those signs and we're  
22 going to get a lot better reductions in speed and people  
23 slowing up as they approach the work area.

24           So -- and, Lieutenant, as far as the motorcycle part  
25 of it, one thing that hasn't been mentioned is that in Texas

1 they're using them on I-35, on an interstate. So motorcycles,  
2 trucks, cars, you name it, going much higher rates of speed  
3 than we're going to be doing in here, and they've had no issues  
4 whatsoever. So --

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Did you say Highway 35 in Texas?

6 MR. JEFFREY: I-35 in Texas.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: I-35. Okay.

8 MR. JEFFREY: I mean, literally hundreds of -- of --  
9 they put them out almost every night on the I35 right now,  
10 so --

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Any questions from --  
12 for this speaker? Thank you.

13 Next one.

14 MR. GOTTS: Good afternoon. I'm Tim Gotts from  
15 Plastic Safety. My company has been working with rumble strips  
16 for the last six years. We've got a lot of experience around  
17 the country. I'd like to -- I'd like to address the posted  
18 speed question, and then give a short history on the, actually,  
19 the birth of this concept.

20 But on the -- on the posted speed, in Texas where the  
21 rumble strips are certified for use on roads of 75-mile-an-hour  
22 or less, being Texas they're rural two-lane roadways are posted  
23 75. So it had to -- it had to demonstrate safe and effective  
24 use in that area.

25 The State of Utah began using rumble strips about a

1 year ago on their -- on their interstate system where they had  
2 a lane drop in rural areas. Their interstates are posted --  
3 recently changed to 80-mile-an-hour. Their product testing  
4 over the winter has been tested at 80-mile-an-hour and found  
5 that they're both stable and effective in alerting drivers.  
6 And alerting drivers is really the whole point of this. The --  
7 the key that we're trying to address with -- with this item is  
8 not only flagger safety, but also drivers that are in the --  
9 most of the work zone fatalities, of course, are -- are  
10 unfortunately drivers. So we've got -- we've got two different  
11 sets of customers we're trying to address.

12           In 2004 State of Kansas was re-paving a section of  
13 US-50 about 20 miles north of Wichita. It was a 20-mile work  
14 area. In 6 weeks they had 3 multiple fatality crashes in which  
15 9 people were killed, 15 people were injured. Needless to say,  
16 Kansas DOT and the contractor got a lot of unwarranted interest  
17 from National Transportation Highway Safety Board and others.  
18 They then went to industry and said what can you do to address  
19 this situation?

20           And there's a couple of quirks there that created the  
21 concept we're dealing with now. As they were doing asphalt  
22 paving, that is a relatively fast moving operation. So  
23 they're -- they would be paving from seven to nine miles --  
24 lane miles a day. That's too long a work zone to make -- to be  
25 able to establish conventional traffic control. They needed

1 something that would move with the paver as it moved down the  
2 road. So they needed something that would not be permanently  
3 affixed to the road but still would deliver the alert to the  
4 driver. And as time evolved we came up with the product that  
5 you're looking at now.

6 But the cogent part of the story is in 2011 that same  
7 section of roadway came up for repaving. Same resident  
8 engineer, the same construction company, same construction  
9 superintendent who was extremely concerned about setting up on  
10 that roadway based on the history they had in the prior job.  
11 So they -- the difference in the job from 2004 and 2011 was the  
12 use of rumble strips. And instead of having in a six-week  
13 period, three fatal crashes, during the entire five months of  
14 the paving program they not only had no fatalities, they had no  
15 crashes. So they definitely alerted the people as they were  
16 approaching the queue so that they were approaching it safely.

17 Thank you for your attention.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you very much. Questions for  
19 the speaker please? Thanks for sharing the information. Very  
20 helpful. Okay.

21 MR. WALTER: Jay Walter. Mr. Chairman, Committee  
22 Members, one of the things, too, that I'll vouch for personal  
23 experience is having had the use of temporary rumble strips in  
24 advance of a construction zone in the past. It's been a long  
25 time ago. But the additional thing that they provided was an

1 audible indication to the flagger and anyone that was near the  
2 beginning of that work zone. So not only the tactile feel for  
3 the driver and the noise for the driver, but also for those  
4 that were -- needed to be aware that vehicles were approaching.

5 In looking at the language that's proposed I do agree  
6 with Committee Member Greenwood that there should be some  
7 language talking about this as optional rather than it's in  
8 some way inferred as required. So that would be something I  
9 think the Committee should look at and potentially add to this  
10 language.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you very much.  
12 Johnny?

13 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. I would like to close  
14 out with a few, at least comments that came up, a couple of  
15 things. First of all, I do want to again, just background  
16 overall. I want to point out that out of the 12 items that we  
17 are working on, the other item was the one that I brought to  
18 the Committee in October that was speed reduction in work  
19 zones. This is the second item. And they both relate to the  
20 manual. And we are trying to get them done before June 20th  
21 because Caltrans is under intense pressure from the lawmakers.  
22 Around June 20th we have to report on this. So that's why we  
23 are having some urgency.

24 At the same time, also, I wanted to highlight a few  
25 things. First, Gordon here is representing maintenance. For

1 those of you who know, he used to work with us. So we have  
2 construction, maintenance and traffic from our side, as well as  
3 the experiments that we have to back us up.

4 And then apart from that, the way we have the  
5 policies, of course, we are in future going to, I'll be honest  
6 with you, expand the use in other ways. But right now I wanted  
7 to limit it only for flagger situations. And the way we have  
8 worded it is also the rumble strip sign, on purpose we are  
9 trying to request a new sign for that purpose because bump, dip  
10 are -- they imply deficiency in the roadway. Here, this  
11 implies there's -- by design this device is there.

12 So secondly, the way we have worded it, if you go to  
13 the one-page here, the second paragraph there that we tried to  
14 word, I think -- that's what I think Mark was going to get to.  
15 And we might want -- we can change that. So if you read in red  
16 on this sheet here, right under support after paragraph one we  
17 say, "Portable transverse rumble strips can be used for  
18 flagging operations as they are easy to set out, move or to  
19 relocate." That could be changed. The word "can" if we change  
20 it to "may" I think that will address that, because that was  
21 the intent basically.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: So then we will create option?

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: We'll say option?

25 MR. BHULLAR: So the intent was we were trying to do

1 that. That's why we said "can be used." It says, "May be used  
2 for flagging operation," because we are not forcing, even for  
3 our projects for every flagging operation that we are going to  
4 use this. This is just a tool that can be used if chosen so by  
5 the engineers.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: Will that address your concern, Mr.  
7 Greenwood, if we just change the word "can" to "might" or  
8 "may," or you want other clarification?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I would prefer if it  
10 said, "Portable transverse rumble strips are optional for use  
11 in flagging operations."

12 MR. BHULLAR: But if we say "may" that -- that -- the  
13 way -- the formatting of the manual is we don't say this is  
14 optional anywhere. Optional is used by the word "may;" that's  
15 throughout the manual. So I would rather refer -- you allow me  
16 to stick to the format.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Well, I'll defer to you.

18 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Kevin?

20 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
21 Administration.

22 Mark, to your point, the -- that very first paragraph  
23 or sentences within that, it's a support statement just trying  
24 to use in general terms the -- where we use support statements  
25 throughout the manual just to describe what the traffic control

1 device is as a whole. And then the standard statements that  
2 are within 6F.87, those are standard statements to define  
3 physically how the traffic control device is created. But to  
4 use these rumble strips it's actually a guidance statement in  
5 paragraph nine that says they should be used in a flagging  
6 operation. So that gives you the option. It's not -- it's one  
7 step higher than option. It's saying a guidance statement, it  
8 should be used but it's not a standard shall statement. The  
9 only shall statements is just describing how the device -- the  
10 makeup of the device itself. With an application it's a  
11 guidance statement in paragraph nine.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Good -- good observation.  
13 Thank you.

14 Any other questions or comments? Nobody from the  
15 audience? Okay.

16 I still didn't hear a clear answer to the  
17 lieutenant's concern about the motorcycles going over the 12-  
18 inch high rumble strip.

19 MR. BHULLAR: Well, Tim, can you help me with that?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Twelve inch?

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: I mean, because -- because he --  
22 they probably have done some testing in the academy and --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Yeah. When we, like I said  
24 before, when we tested at the academy we -- I mean, we have in  
25 the pictures the motorcycle tires both leaving the ground.



1 There was concern as far as the speed, what the speeds were  
2 going to be leading up to those and if -- what kind of signage  
3 was going to be required if the rumble strips were used to  
4 alert the motorcyclists.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. The signage is like I'm showing  
6 my package here. The sign will be a rumble strips sign placed  
7 in advance, not right at the rumble strip. And as per the  
8 Table 2C-4 criteria, generally the way it works in the manual,  
9 because you don't want to warn of something right there, you  
10 have to give them enough notification under the perception time  
11 motion (inaudible) times. So on page 50 of the agenda, that's  
12 the sign that I show. Regarding your concern regarding higher  
13 speeds, of course, I do not have any experience. But the  
14 report does indicate some of the information. But either  
15 Gordon or maybe Tim, you can help me with that. I'd appreciate  
16 it.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: So those signs would be  
18 required to be used?

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yes.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Yes. The device is optional, the  
21 rumble strip. But if chosen to, then it shall be with the --  
22 the way it is shown the sign package, which sign and where it  
23 goes, the location and the sign.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Okay. Thanks.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Gordon, do you have anything to add?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yeah. He's going to  
2 answer -- there was a question (inaudible).

3 MR. WONG: Gordon Wong from Caltrans. I'm here to  
4 answer the motorcycle question. We did test in CHP Academy.  
5 And two motorcycle officers ran over those rumble strips at 65  
6 miles an hour back and forth without any issues. And we put  
7 water over the rumble strips and they ran over again and there  
8 was no -- any issues. And the dimension setup, it's not much  
9 different than what we used on the Bay Bridge S curve. And the  
10 ADT (phonetic) is -- I think it was 30,000 motorists per hour  
11 or something like that. And there's lots of motorcycles that  
12 regularly passes on the Bay Bridge. There was no -- no -- no  
13 problem reported.

14 Also, we tested on Highway 99 which is one of the  
15 major highways in -- in California. And then we tested at 99  
16 and 20 in Yuba City. That's one of the major-major junctions  
17 for California highway systems. Lots of motorcycles ran  
18 through them without any glitch. So -- and that's at 65 miles  
19 an hour.

20 So we do not see any issue with motorcycles and the  
21 speed.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you. Rick, are you  
23 satisfied?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Yeah.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you. Okay. You're

1     okay?   Good.

2                 Johnny, do you have something to add?

3                 MR. BHULLAR:   Yeah.   I do hear David's concern  
4     regarding the sign, the rumble strip.   So I just noticed that  
5     if you look at paragraph number five up there, the federal  
6     policy was already there.   They did not identify a sign.   So I  
7     was just trying to use that policy.   And basically the way it's  
8     written, the second sentence in there is under paragraph five,  
9     it says, "A sign warning drivers of the onset of rumble strips  
10    may be placed in advance of any transverse rumble strip  
11    installation."

12                So the sign is optional.   The device is optional.  
13    But if there is a concern regarding motorcyclists being  
14    surprised with this device, and in our case when we are using  
15    in advance of flaggers if you want, I hear an opportunity now,  
16    we could maybe increase it to a guidance or a shall.   I'm  
17    certainly open to it.   But I'll be honest that I misspoke.  
18    Actually, it is optional the way it's written.

19                MR. KORTH:   Johnny, this guidance is at the bottom.

20                MR. BHULLAR:   Yeah.   The guidance at the bottom is  
21    actually the sign should be placed -- it's talking about the  
22    location or the placement.   But whether the sign is used or not  
23    is optional the way it's written.   So I did misspeak earlier.

24                COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS:   Yeah.   I would think the --  
25    the sign -- in my opinion the sign should be there with -- on

1 the --

2 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: -- if the rumble strips are  
4 going to be used, just --

5 MR. BHULLAR: I'll be open to the friendly amendment  
6 there.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: All right. I agree, especially  
8 since their use is going to be optional itself. So now the  
9 motorcyclists or a driver even does not expect to see them at  
10 all construction locations. So you need to let them know that  
11 there are rumble strips. So if you are not -- if you are using  
12 rumble strips you must put a sign, I think. I agree with you.

13 Any other comments, suggestions, thoughts? Okay. So  
14 do we need a motion on this?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I will move the motion, make  
16 a recommendation as suggested by the Committee to make a sign  
17 shall requirement --

18 MR. BHULLAR: Should or shall?

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Shall

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Shall. So -- and adopt the  
21 language as proposed by Caltrans.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. A second to the motion? Is  
23 there a second?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Second.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion and a second. Any

1 more comments, discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say  
2 aye.

3 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: Any opposition? The motion passes  
5 unanimously. The changes are recommended. Thank you. Okay.

6 MR. BHULLAR: And Caltrans thanks the Committee.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Okay. Mr. Kenney, you  
8 said we would break about now for lunch. Okay. I know that we  
9 need to finish by about what, 2:30?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: 2:30.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Because people have flights at 4:10.  
12 So if we break for lunch, is that --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Half an hour.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- if it's good now?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Yes.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: How is your cafeteria situation? Is  
17 half-hour reasonable?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: We'll know when we see the  
19 crowd in there. But usually a half-hour would be fine.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So let's reconvene back here  
21 at one o'clock. Thank you.

22 (Off the Record at 12:29 p.m.)

23 (On the Record at 1:10 p.m.)

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: Let's call the meeting back to  
25 order. Call the meeting of the California Traffic Control

1 Devices of May 14th back to order. It's 1:10 in the afternoon.  
2 I would like to thank Mr. Kenney and County of San Diego for  
3 hosting a very delicious lunch. Thank you very much, Mike. We  
4 appreciate it.

5 Let's get back on the agenda. We are now on agenda  
6 item 14-16 which is amendments to various section figures of  
7 Part 2 Signs of California MUTCD 2012.

8 Mr. Devinder?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Mr. Chairman, I will invite  
10 Mr. Don Howe to address this item.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Mr. Howe?

12 MR. HOWE: Okay. Thank you. We had a workshop,  
13 probably over a year ago in March of 2013, and most of you were  
14 there. And we came up with items that we wanted to recommend  
15 for Part 2 Signs. And so I'll ask Johnny to track through  
16 this. We have a total of five items, and there are sub parts  
17 to each one. So if you want to follow like we've done the  
18 other ones, we'll do them one at a time.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah, pretty much. Yeah.

20 MR. HOWE: Item number one --

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: It will be less controversial.

22 MR. HOWE: -- begins on page 110. And this -- this  
23 submittal, page 110 shows language that we're undeleting. So  
24 the item, I think, we have people in the audience who want to  
25 come and comment on this. But we're looking to agree with

1 Bryan Everard of TAPCO regarding Section 2A.07, and wondered  
2 why we could not include the border of LED lights for  
3 regulatory signs.

4           So what our submittal is, is in paragraph 06-A is to  
5 delete "stop" and replace with "regulatory." And then further  
6 down in paragraph eight we would undelete what's show in red  
7 there. I think item D would -- would remain deleted there.  
8 But basically the -- we would undelete the strike through in  
9 paragraph -- in paragraph 11 on page 111. And in figure -- I'm  
10 sorry, Table 2A-1 shown on page 128, which is agenda page 55,  
11 to delete "stop" and just say "border of regulatory or warning  
12 signs." So that would be the compliment of item number one.

13           CHAIR BAHADORI: I'm pretty sure we have it  
14 somewhere, I just can't find it here, that says what color LED  
15 light can be used on the borders of the regulatory sign. I  
16 think it says very clearly, so --

17           MR. HOWE: Bottom of page 53 of the agenda talks  
18 about, "If used, LEDs shall have a maximum diameter of a  
19 quarter inch and the following colors based on the type of  
20 sign, white or red if used with stop or yield signs --

21           CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah, yeah. Okay.

22           MR. HOWE: -- and so forth.

23           CHAIR BAHADORI: So -- so it's pretty much white for  
24 all regulatory because red is only for the stop sign; right?

25           MR. HOWE: I think we included stop or yield signs,

1 white or red.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

3 MR. HOWE: And then otherwise it would be white for  
4 regulatory signs.

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. We just didn't want to have a  
6 Christmas tree out there, people using different colors. Okay.  
7 So this is the first recommendation. Any questions, comments?  
8 Mr. Bhullar?

9 MR. BHULLAR: Just a little bit, I want to touch on  
10 the background also, that here there was about five separate  
11 public comments and requests for different types of signs. For  
12 example, the "Do Not Enter" and the "Wrong Way" signs need --  
13 then the other one was the "Do Not Stop On Tracks" and passive  
14 type of crossings since there really is no power. So we are  
15 trying to sum up all those and trying to address it this way.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: Any questions, comments? Okay.  
17 Anybody in the audience? Mr. Royer, and then the lady.

18 MR. ROYER: Dave Royer, Consultant. Being on the  
19 National Committee, and also on the IT Delegation, I get all  
20 the stuff to review and comment on for IT comments. And the  
21 flashing LEDs on the border of signs is one of the items that  
22 is being proposed for the 2016 Federal MUTCD. And  
23 unfortunately, I got this revised agenda just after I had  
24 deleted the -- the entire document after I'd commented on it.  
25 But the -- basically, they were recommending that the color of



1 the LEDs match the color of the background of the signs.

2           The one -- one thing I disagreed with them, I felt  
3 that they had said white for a stop sign and I said, you know,  
4 the flashing red, we've been using that for 15 years throughout  
5 the United States now since BlinkerStop invented the sign and  
6 TAPCO marketed it.

7           And so my only comments are, and I'll kind of go  
8 through them, the maximum diameter of a quarter of an inch,  
9 that may get things a little too proprietary. My opinion, it  
10 should be maybe no wider than the border of the sign, the  
11 border stripe of the sign. And most borders of signs are about  
12 half-an-inch wide. Some are even up to an inch depending on  
13 the size. And so rather than say a maximum quarter inch,  
14 somebody may want to use a little cluster of LEDs instead of  
15 Blinker Stop's single LED with the reflector. And so I'd  
16 recommend that.

17           Secondly, on number A up there, I believe red should  
18 be used with the stop sign, background color is red, and  
19 flashing red means stop. Red should not be used with the yield  
20 sign because flashing red means stop, not yield. So I would  
21 say "Red, if used with a stop." Then go down to B and say  
22 "White, if used with regulatory signs," period, because the  
23 yield sign is a regulatory sign. "Yellow, if used with warning  
24 signs." You're proposing nothing on -- on guide signs. They  
25 said, if I remember right, the proposal on the federal level

1 was -- was "White or green on guide signs," but you scratched  
2 out guide signs. On E, "Orange, with temporary traffic control  
3 warning signs," so again, matching the background color. And  
4 "Yellow or yellow-green," they can make a yellow green, "Yellow  
5 or yellow-green, if used with school area or crossing warning  
6 signs," because crossing warning sign are also the yellow-  
7 green."

8           Outside of that, that's my only comment, just  
9 basically to match the background and keep the flashing red for  
10 the stop sign only. And they also had proposed a flashing red  
11 for "Do Not Enter" sign, I think on the federal level. But  
12 unfortunately I dumped it, so I couldn't go back and cross  
13 reference my -- my comments.

14           CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Any question for Mr.  
15 Royer? Yes, Devinder?

16           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So you want to recommend  
17 under paragraph eight we delete one-fourth of inch?

18           MR. ROYER: I would say "Maximum diameter no wider  
19 than the standard border of the sign," so we don't get big  
20 eight-inch ones in the border. Keep the border size. And I  
21 don't know where the quarter inch came from. So there's no --  
22 no sign has a quarter of an inch border. I think the minimum  
23 is half inch, so --

24           CHAIR BAHADORI: Any other questions? Thank you,  
25 Dave.

1           MR. ROYER: And then just basically match the color  
2 of the background with the signs.

3           CHAIR BAHADORI: Sure.

4           MR. ROYER: And you may want to keep the guide signs.  
5 I could think of places I might like to have a guide sign that  
6 got your attention --

7           CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

8           MR. ROYER: -- kind of like "Freeway Onramp Right  
9 Lane" or something.

10          CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

11          MR. ROYER: So -- but anyways, that's my comment.

12          CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thanks. Do you want to  
13 answer to Dave?

14          MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

15          CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Go ahead.

16          MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. I wanted to respond to  
17 Dave's comments so that we don't go away thinking we are going  
18 to accept all that. At least my initial reaction is I do agree  
19 with the color issue, and that should be as part of the  
20 background color. And that's how it is in the manual. But  
21 regarding the diameter of a quarter inch, this is something  
22 that the feds have and it's a shall, and that's what we adopt.  
23 So I would be hard pressed to find a reason to deviate from a  
24 federal standard. So I will not, at least initially --

25          CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

1           MR. BHULLAR: -- go that route. Then apart from  
2 that, the issue regarding -- just to -- for everyone's benefit,  
3 if we look at it, the feds allow the use of LEDs on guide  
4 signs, warning signs, regulatory signs on the border, within  
5 the border, the legend, a number of ways. And what we did is  
6 we initially said only warning signs and on the bottom. Now  
7 we're trying to just expand it, still staying only on the  
8 border but just expanding from warning to regulatory and  
9 stopping there. So we don't want --

10           CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

11           MR. BHULLAR: -- at least we don't propose a wider  
12 latitude than that.

13           CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Thank you. That lady?

14           MS. DOBBS: Amada Dobbs with TAPCO. California is  
15 currently the only state that has not adapted the Federal MUTCD  
16 for LED-enhanced signage. I agree, the main thing is that the  
17 LED should match the background of the sign. So I agree with  
18 the stop signs, they should be red. Yield goes either way  
19 because of the -- the yield sign can be white or red. There  
20 has been several agencies, as Johnny said, that are asking for  
21 regulatory signs. They are used nationwide and they have been  
22 proven very effective. The -- the yellow signs only where it  
23 signs for F, "White or yellow, if used with school area signs,"  
24 it should only be yellow because all school signs are  
25 florescent yellow or florescent yellow-green. But basically

1 just expanding it, like Johnny said, to regulatory signs.

2 I agree that the quarter-inch, that is a federal  
3 standard, so that should stay. But the general gist here is  
4 just to expanding it to regulatory signs and allowing LEDs  
5 on -- on signage matching the background of the signs. I don't  
6 think you need to change too much or get too detailed, like --  
7 like he was talking about. But that's my comment.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Anyone else? Johnny?

9 MR. BHULLAR: Amanda, if I may, can you share with us the  
10 type of signs, like in regulatory, that other states are using  
11 LEDs on, just as examples.

12 MS. DOBBS: "Speed Limit" signs are -- are the first  
13 ones. The biggest regulatory sign that they're used on is the  
14 "Speed Limit" signs. They use them as an alternative to the  
15 radar feedback signs. They'll do the -- the blinking "Speed  
16 Limit" signs that are either flashing all the time or they'll  
17 have them radar activated, but those have been proven very  
18 effective. We had a couple other regulatory signs where it was  
19 like "Neighborhood Watch" things.

20 I do agree that you could approve the guide signs.  
21 Actually, Caltrans was requesting to use a guide sign on a road  
22 where they wanted to use a sign to let people know when they  
23 needed to have chains on their tires. But, yes, that -- that's  
24 correct. Yeah.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: All right. Thank you. Anyone else?

1 Thank you. Okay. Bringing it back to the Committee, this  
2 is -- LEDs are really good, but the best way to ruin something  
3 that's really good is by overusing. So I'm glad we are staying  
4 focused and we are still limiting to only the border, and we're  
5 matching the background color. We don't want to just trace the  
6 letters with the LED and stuff like that. I've seen it like in  
7 Florida and places like that. Not only do they look ugly, I  
8 think they're even more confusing. They're even more difficult  
9 to understand. But anyways, I see one person nodding.

10 Any other comments, questions on this issue, on the  
11 issue of the quarter inch, if it's a federal shall then there's  
12 nothing really we can do; we have to leave it there.

13 Mr. Greenwood?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I think this is an area  
15 I'd like to see us conform a little closer to the -- to the  
16 National Manual, that if LEDs are good in the entire sign in 49  
17 other states I don't know why California is special and it  
18 shouldn't have it here. On the other hand, I agree with Mr.  
19 Royer completely that stop signs should be red and only red,  
20 and that's the only place where it should be used. Maybe the  
21 "Do Not Enter" or the "Wrong Way" might be the only other case.  
22 And at the same time I'm arguing for conforming with the  
23 National Manual.

24 I don't see what the limit of a quarter inch is  
25 getting us, and that that -- I'd like to see us lead in this.

1 And maybe those in the room or on the National Committee maybe  
2 have that item taken up in that matching the LED to the border  
3 size seems to make perfect sense.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Any other thoughts,  
5 suggestions? Okay. Is there a motion to --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Who made -- who made the  
7 motion?

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: What's that?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Who made the motion?

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: No one has made the motion yet. I'm  
11 saying -- I'm asking for a motion.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay, I'll give it a try.

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: No, not interested in this issue?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I'll give  
15 it a try. I move approval of the recommendation with the  
16 following edits: To have red apply to stop only, and then  
17 white apply to other regulatory including yield, to delete  
18 yellow as a choice for temporary traffic control, and to delete  
19 white as a choice for school area and add yellow-green. No  
20 other changes.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Wait. Wait, Johnny. Wait.  
22 There is -- there is a motion, so is there a second?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Second.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Now that we have a motion and  
25 a second we can have discussion. You have something to add?

1           MR. BHULLAR: I just want to clarify. When we are  
2 talking about, I believe F regarding white or yellow, the  
3 intent there in the school area was to include the school speed  
4 limit or something, the regulatory and the warning, both types  
5 of school signs. So the school speed limit assembly will be  
6 considered a regulatory, so that's why I put white. And the  
7 yellow will be for the assemblies for the crosswalk warning  
8 assemblies. So that's what we are trying to do with the  
9 subheading F. But if we do just yellow for warning portion and  
10 not the regulatory, then --

11           CHAIR BAHADORI: So why do we even -- just in my  
12 mind, why do we need even a distinction for a school zone? If  
13 we just say regulatory signs are white and --

14           MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

15           CHAIR BAHADORI: -- or warning signs --

16           MR. BHULLAR: Probably just --

17           CHAIR BAHADORI: -- are yellow --

18           MR. BHULLAR: -- delete it altogether.

19           CHAIR BAHADORI: -- then it doesn't matter what part  
20 of town they're installing them.

21           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: OK.

22           MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

23           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: -- we can delete it.

24           MR. BHULLAR: We can delete F.

25           CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Because there is no



1 difference between a school zone or anyplace else. We are not  
2 regulating the installation based on the location but on the  
3 type of signs, so --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I delete my -- I amend my  
5 motion to delete item F.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: My second, as well.

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: The green-yellow, the florescent  
11 green, is that still the option?

12 MS. DOBBS: The LEDs are amber with either a  
13 florescent yellow or a yellow sign.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: She is the representative from the  
15 manufacturer. They are the people who make it. She knows what  
16 she's talking about.

17 MS. DOBBS: Yeah. With the florescent yellow-green  
18 or the florescent yellow sign the LEDs will be amber.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

20 MS. DOBBS: And that's per recommendation.

21 MR. HOWE: Just remember, at night-time florescent  
22 yellow-green signs appear yellow.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Oh, okay.

24 MR. HOWE: They don't have those blue wavelengths of  
25 light --

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

2 MR. HOWE: -- in the daytime sky.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So we don't want to go there.

4 So the motion is as is, with no amendments. Are there any

5 other comments, discussion?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: No. Actually, we did

7 amend the motion --

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Oh, after -- yeah.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: -- with the --

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: I mean, on the second issue.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: -- with item F. Yes.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. On the -- on the deletion of

13 item F, yes, but not on the florescent green.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: I thought the opportunity

15 to use all red on "Do Not Enter" was a good thing. Is there

16 any interest in including that? We already use "Wrong Way" red

17 RPMs, and so I think --

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: I can see the value in that myself.

19 Do you guys -- are you guys amenable to allow the red, not only

20 for stop but for "Do Not Enter" and "Wrong Way" as well?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yeah. I think for me,

22 one of the "Wrong Way" signs, at least, is red; right? So

23 we're really doing the same thing in matching the background

24 color in that particular case. So, yeah, I would think that

25 would be fine.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: You've got to turn your  
2 mikes off.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I am okay with that as  
5 well. Thank you.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So the motion is actually --  
7 let me actually understand what the motion is. So the motion  
8 is to allow red only for a "Stop" sign and "Do Not Enter" and  
9 "Wrong Way," and then everything else regulatory is white, and  
10 everything else is yellow

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- I mean, for warning is yellow.  
13 Now, Mr. Greenwood?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Can I ask why we're  
15 deleting line D for guide signs, that if, you know, Caltrans  
16 doesn't want to do it on guide signs, that's fine. But if an  
17 agency wanted to --

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: -- put LEDs on a guide  
20 sign, they should be allowed to do it.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: That's going to be green LED on  
22 green guide sign; right?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Either white or green.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: Either white or green.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Well, it says "White, if

1 used in guide signs."

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: How --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I would rather leave my  
4 motion as is. I'd prefer to not go there.

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Johnny, do you have something  
6 specific to that?

7 MR. BHULLAR: Just -- just a comment for Mark is that  
8 initially when we looked at this back in, I believe, 2006 when  
9 we were trying to adopt the 2003 manual and the LEDs became an  
10 issue from the feds, at that time John Fisher had indicated  
11 that, of course, we did not want to have our signs become neon  
12 signs all the -- so that's why we had restricted it only to  
13 warning.

14 So as -- the proposals that have crossed our desk  
15 have been pretty much the regulatory signs, whether they are  
16 "Do Not Stop On Tracks" or -- so there are five or six types of  
17 requests that have come through, and all of them have been  
18 regulatory. So we had a basis for that. That's why we were  
19 proposing to -- but green, we are neutral on that.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So the maker of the motion,  
21 you're still with your motion; right?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: That's correct.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Okay.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: That's good.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Any further discussions or comments?

1 No? All those in favor say aye.

2 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing none, the motion  
4 passes unanimously.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: The change is recommended. Okay.

7 Next one, Mr. Howe.

8 MR. HOWE: Thank you. Number two is we need to  
9 replace or undelete the federal standard as it is not clear for  
10 Section 2B.37. And these are on the following pages, 165 --  
11 let's see, it's on page 56 and 57 of the agenda. And as we  
12 reviewed this item with Kevin Korth, the Federal Highway  
13 Administration, he made an interesting observation. So based  
14 on what we have here we're undeleting this -- this language.  
15 And as we refer to the figure 2B.12, we notice that that's  
16 crossed out in the current MUTCD because the "Do Not Enter" and  
17 "Wrong Way" signs are shown as separate postings in that  
18 figure. And in the California Figure 2B-12(CA) it shows that  
19 those are an assembly, always posted together.

20 So for one other detail on that, paragraph four talks  
21 about the "Do Not Enter" sign may be installed where it's  
22 necessary. And the concept is, is that in our standard  
23 language on page 57 we have California language in paragraph 7  
24 and 8 that talks about these being posted together. And so for  
25 that reason I would offer this item number two with the

1 following changes: We would not undelete paragraph four with  
2 respect to paragraphs seven and eight that follow on the next  
3 page, and that we would refer to Figure 2B-12, the California  
4 version, (CA) in -- as referenced in paragraph two and in  
5 paragraph five on page 57.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Howe on  
7 this? Any comments? Any questions or comments from the  
8 audience?

9 Do we have a motion for approval?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I will move the motion.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: We have a motion to approve. Is  
12 there a second?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Second.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion and a second. All  
15 those in favor say aye.

16 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Hearing none, the  
18 motion passes unanimously. The changes on 56 and 57, approved,  
19 recommended.

20 Moving on. Next one.

21 MR. HOWE: Okay. The third item is -- and this is  
22 Section 2J.07 for the specific service signs. And the specific  
23 reference is on -- let's see -- on the agenda page --

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: Is that 58?

25 MR. HOWE: It should be 58, that's correct. So Steve

1 Pyburn's concern was that it was -- it added value to -- to  
2 undelete this. And so our proposal, what is shown in red was  
3 deleted but it's now proposed to be undeleted.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So basically it was National  
5 language we deleted before. We are reinstating back. So --

6 MR. HOWE: Yes.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. We shouldn't have deleted it.  
8 Okay. This is a minor editorial in my mind. But any comments,  
9 questions? Okay. Nobody from the audience ?

10 Any motion? Yes, Mr. Patterson?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I move approval.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion. Second?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Second.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion and a second. All  
15 those in favor say aye.

16 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Hearing none, it  
18 passes. The change on page 58 is recommended.

19 Moving on.

20 MR. HOWE: Item four, the California style of the  
21 half-width exit tabs that are either inset into the main sign  
22 above it, they look awful. Please, as -- as is practice in  
23 other states, use the separate tab above the main sign. And  
24 the idea was to delete sign specifications G83-4(CA), and also  
25 G85-10(CA) that would basically delete the -- the dead green

1 space in the upper left-hand corner. So we're referring to  
2 several items on pages -- beginning on page 59 where we would  
3 delete reference to that in paragraph 20, on page 60 delete  
4 paragraph 36, delete the reference in paragraph 38 on page 60,  
5 and also on page 61 delete paragraph 44 and any reference on  
6 paragraph 45, 46 and 47. You can see the -- the figure would  
7 be affected as shown on pages 62 and 63 where we would delete  
8 that out.

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

10 MR. HOWE: And then I guess Table 2E-1 would also  
11 have those -- those lines deleted out of it.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: So all Caltrans are all for freeway  
13 use. Any comments, suggestions? How about the audience?

14 Seeing none, all -- is there a motion to approve the  
15 package?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Move approval.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: There's a motion. Is there a  
18 second?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Second.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: There is a second. Any discussion?  
21 All those in favor please say aye.

22 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Hearing none, the  
24 motion is approved. The motion is passed. The changes are  
25 recommended.



1           Moving on to page 65.

2           MR. HOWE: Okay. Item five as shown on pages 65, 66,  
3 68 -- 67, 68 was to place in the assembly -- I'll talk about  
4 the blue signs. Let's talk about the three panels that are  
5 together that as I -- I misunderstood this item. So I showed  
6 putting the cardinal direction to the top of the total grouping  
7 of four signs.

8           And, Devinder, did you want to talk about that?

9           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes. Well, for the record,  
10 I put a handout which contains the letter received yesterday  
11 from Mr. Herman. So it's placed next to your agendas.

12           MR. HOWE: Yes. Ralph Herman who made this original  
13 edit suggestion back a couple of years ago, several years ago,  
14 he wanted some clarification there that we would be placing  
15 that cardinal direction at the top of the three blue panels and  
16 have the "Freeway Entrance" sign be the top sign in that four-  
17 panel assembly. And as we reviewed that, that -- that would be  
18 our -- our specific proposal. There would be, I think as he  
19 understood our figure, proposal A on the left, and there's the  
20 Ralph Herman proposal on the right. We concur with Ralph that  
21 that's the more correct version, is to have that shown on the  
22 top of the route shield rather than on top of the entire  
23 assembly.

24           CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Looks simple and reasonable  
25 enough to me. But comments, questions? Anybody from the

1 audience?

2 Is there a motion to approve?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: So moved.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: And a second?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Question. I'm just  
6 catching up. I was trying to find it in the agenda. And  
7 failing to do that, I realized it's on the big screen. Which  
8 is the proposal?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: It's one handout on your  
10 desk I put this morning.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I thought it was on the  
12 screen.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: On your computer it's the  
14 right one which we are looking at --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: -- on the computer, too,  
17 so --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: -- yeah.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So B --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So B is the motion?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yeah.

24 MR. HOWE: B is the motion. And we concur with the  
25 commenter.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I'll second it.

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. There's a motion and a  
3 second. Any comments or discussion? All those in favor say  
4 aye.

5 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: Opposition? Hearing none, the  
7 motion passes unanimously, and the changes as proposed are  
8 recommended.

9 Thank you, Mr. Howe.

10 MR. HOWE: Thank you.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Moving on the agenda, we are  
12 done with our --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Action items.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- action items. And now we are  
15 moving on to our request for experimentation, item 10-3.

16 Mr. Greenwood, that's the experiment with "Second  
17 Train" warning sign.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Let me give update on this,  
19 I never discussed with Mr. Greenwood. But I just put this item  
20 on the agenda, to see if anyone interested in the study, so  
21 they can see the report. Anyhow, city is -- City of Riverside  
22 first are going to discuss with FHWA their proposal. And after  
23 getting okay from FHWA, they will come to this Committee and  
24 present their report.

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So this is for information  
2 only, if anyone interested to see their study.

3 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you. So it doesn't  
4 need any action at this point. Thanks for the information.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: No.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: And we have the website in case you  
7 are interested.

8 Moving on to discussion items, item 14-13 is  
9 something that was brought up to the Committee's attention by  
10 Mr. Lissner in our previous meeting. And it's a proposal to  
11 amend Section 2B.54 of the California MUTCD to require the use  
12 of the blank out "Not Turn on Red" sign at certain  
13 intersections where automated enforcement is in use.

14 Mr. Lissner is in the audience. Do you want to speak  
15 to the item yourself? And I understand that Mr. Beeber also  
16 has a brief presentation that he wants to make.

17 MR. LISSNER: (Off mike.) (Inaudible.)

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Would you come -- I can't hear you.

19 MR. BEEBER: He asked me -- he asked if I could go --  
20 if I could go first.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Sure, that's fine.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So this item is on page 41  
23 of 46 of the agenda, 41, 42, 43.

24 MR. BEEBER: Hi. Jay Beeber. Safer Streets L.A. and  
25 Reason Foundation.

1           So this was brought forward by Mr. Lissner. It was  
2 from a conversation that we had been having regarding a  
3 situation in Chatsworth and some other areas that we've noticed  
4 some problems where there are "No Right Turn on Red" signs, yet  
5 there are still a lot of violations occurring, as evidenced by  
6 some places where there is some photo enforcement.

7           So if you can look on the map, this is the Orange bus  
8 line in Chatsworth. There are -- it runs north-south. This is  
9 an extension that they added. There's Canoga Avenue -- it's a  
10 little hard to see on the map -- it runs parallel to it.  
11 The -- there's a number of cross streets that cross both the  
12 bus line and Canoga Avenue. And those are all photo enforced  
13 with a "No Right Turn on Red" off of Canoga Avenue.

14           This is an example of one of those intersections.  
15 This is Canoga Avenue here. This is the busway. And what  
16 they're saying is that during a red light they are not  
17 permitting a right turn for somebody traveling northbound to  
18 make the right turn. And there are different -- at different  
19 intersections there's -- there's a different distance between  
20 making the right turn and then coming across the busway. But  
21 basically they're all, you know, within a couple of feet or so.  
22 And so their concern is that if somebody makes a right turn on  
23 red there won't be enough time for them to recognize that it --  
24 that the bus is coming. There's no gates or anything there.

25           So this is how they have the intersection currently

1 signed and signalized. So there's -- a right-turn-on-red  
2 prohibition is in effect at all times. So this is the right-  
3 hand lane here. There is a no-right-turn-on-red arrow. There  
4 are two signs, "No Right Turn on Red." And when a bus is  
5 coming where it's going to cross the -- the cross street,  
6 basically then they have a little blank-out sign that pops up  
7 here and lights up and says "Bus."

8           Now in our last -- the last meeting I asked this  
9 question, whether this bus sign was an approved traffic control  
10 device in the State of California, and I was told that it is  
11 not. But this is what they're doing.

12           Now they -- now they also have these blank-out signs  
13 for people crossing the -- crossing the busway on the cross  
14 street. But the bus sign here is a little bit confusing, I  
15 think, to motorists because they are -- there's no bus crossing  
16 their path. It's basically saying there's a bus, and don't  
17 turn right on red. It's not really clear exactly what's  
18 expected of the motorist.

19           And this is what we're seeing in terms of the number  
20 of violations that are occurring. You can see it's -- when  
21 the -- when the -- when the Orange line opened in October 2012,  
22 that's the extension, there were a huge number of violations  
23 occurring. People were not used to this particular  
24 intersection. They were not used to not being allowed to turn  
25 right on red. So you can see it declined over time for the

1 first couple of months, it sort of leveled off. And now it's  
2 sort of ticked up a little bit. But we're sort of an area  
3 where we've got about -- this is -- this is normalized for a  
4 30-day period, and also for -- adjusted for traffic volume.  
5 But on average per month there's about 3,000 violations that  
6 are occurring across the 7 cross streets.

7           And so what is being recommended is that rather than  
8 having the bus signal, you know, the picture of the bus, you'd  
9 have this no -- either, you know, a blank-out sign that says  
10 "No Right Turn on Red" or a symbolic sign. And we're hoping  
11 that this type of thing -- we've seen this in other places as  
12 well. I was using this as a particular example. But that  
13 the -- that the blank-out sign would give more information to  
14 the driver and make it more obvious that they're not allowed to  
15 turn right on red. Now you would think that, you know, all the  
16 signage and everything that was there, there's a lot of things  
17 for people to look at. So for some reason drivers are not  
18 following the restriction, even though they should know what it  
19 is and they should -- and they should follow it, it doesn't  
20 seem as though that it's sort of a willful kind of thing where  
21 people are saying I know I'm not supposed to turn right on red  
22 and they're doing it anyway in the thousands. It's probably  
23 that there's some confusion going on there.

24           And so the other thing is that this "No Right Turn on  
25 Red" restriction is in effect at all times, 24 hours a day.

1 Now the bus line does not run 24 hours a day. Also, there's  
2 plenty of times during a number of cycles when you could turn  
3 right on red because there is no bus coming. So the only  
4 reason that there's a "No Right Turn on Red" is because the bus  
5 might cross that cross street. And so with the blank-out sign  
6 this would give an additional ability to only restrict the  
7 right turn on red when the bus is coming, and not have that  
8 restriction during the rest of the -- the time, the rest of the  
9 signals.

10           So that would, of course, require a little bit of a  
11 change also in the signal itself because you would not -- you  
12 would use a circular red signal there, maybe in addition to the  
13 arrow but not just the arrow. And I just wanted to frame  
14 the -- this information so you could have a little bit more  
15 information as to a particular instance where this is occurring  
16 and why this discussion was being brought forward. And that's  
17 the extent of it. And I don't know, if anybody has any  
18 questions I'm happy to answer those.

19           CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you. Any question at  
20 this time for Mr. Beeber? John?

21           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. The -- the  
22 proposal under discussion ties the requirement for such a  
23 blank-out sign to photo enforcement. But it seems to me, as  
24 you've so ably described, that the issue is the turn  
25 restriction is needed to prevent a collision with the busway.



1 It has nothing to do with photo enforcement. So I'm curious  
2 about why the proposal is formulated that way.

3 MR. BEEBER: Well, I'll let Mr. Lissner speak to  
4 that. I think that as we have discussed in other areas having  
5 to do with photo enforcement that this makes sense where it  
6 makes sense, regardless of whether there's enforcement there.  
7 Our understanding in terms of where there's a lot of violation  
8 of it comes from the photo enforcement. Obviously, I'll let  
9 Mr. Lissner speak to why he feels only at photo enforcement  
10 places it would be necessary. I'd be in favor of it wherever  
11 it -- wherever it's necessary. And unfortunately there's no --  
12 there's no requirement for them to use it. So what we're  
13 seeing is there's still a lot -- they know there's a lot of  
14 violations occurring but they're not doing anything additional  
15 to try to eliminate that. So that may be part of it, but I  
16 will let Mr. Lissner speak to that.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Any other questions for Mr. Beeber?

18 Just one thing on this one. I'm still thinking about  
19 the whole thing myself, but just want to hear from the other  
20 colleagues. On "No Turn on Red," that square one, that  
21 obviously is more confusing because that's applicable only when  
22 you use it with the red circular. And in this case you  
23 actually don't want them to make a turn, you know, when -- when  
24 there's a green circular. So the through movement is shown in  
25 the green. So if I say "No Turn on Red" and I'm seeing

1 something -- I'm seeing a green circular, I'm seeing a red  
2 arrow, that's totally confusing. That's just going to add to  
3 the confusion. And the other one I'm thinking.

4 Any other questions and comments? Mr. Jones?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: In the pictures you showed  
6 the traffic signal already has red arrows, red protected arrows  
7 for the "No Right Turn on Red."

8 MR. BEEBER: That's correct.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: That's all that is needed at  
10 an intersection to tell a motorist what to do. So I don't  
11 think that we should be requiring a jurisdiction to do anything  
12 more than that because then we're going to open up the can of  
13 worms for protected left turn red arrows and everything else  
14 that -- and so I think we need to give some flexibility to the  
15 design engineers at this local agency rather than bringing this  
16 to the state organization.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Any other thoughts, comments?  
18 Okay. Let's listen from others. Let's hear from anyone else  
19 who wishes to speak on this. Mr. Lissner?

20 MR. LISSNER: Jim Lissner. I'll start by answering  
21 the questions. I think the -- the statistics demonstrate the  
22 reason why this additional sign is needed, I mean the  
23 statistics at -- along Canoga Avenue.

24 CHAIR BAHADORI: Could you -- could you -- excuse me,  
25 Mr. Lissner.

1           Could you not close this and go back, actually, to  
2 the picture of the intersection itself, Mr. Howe? Let's not  
3 close this.

4           MR. LISSNER: Actually --

5           CHAIR BAHADORI: Just give me one minute, Mr.  
6 Lissner. Let's -- let's go back and actually have the  
7 intersection picture where the signal heads are visible. If  
8 you go back to -- yeah, that's it. Leave it there. Okay.  
9 That's good. Thanks.

10          Go ahead. Sorry.

11          MR. LISSNER: The -- I might not have said anything  
12 except for the fact that, I mean, I wrote you a letter back in  
13 January talking about these signs because I saw them when I  
14 went through there. And I might not have said anything had it  
15 not been for their use of an unapproved scary distracting sign.

16          But now that we're looking at it, now that I've  
17 looked at it further, and now that we have more of the  
18 statistics from along Canoga Avenue from the cameras which tell  
19 us how many people are making that right turn when they  
20 shouldn't be, it just -- it's telling us that, for whatever  
21 reason, the sign and the red arrows, all that stuff, isn't  
22 working. Something better is needed. And that's -- that's why  
23 I'm recommending this, even -- even though they've got all the  
24 right stuff already. They've got the -- the red arrows for  
25 right turn, but it's not working. The -- the number of tickets

1 is going up instead of going down, and that's kind of bad.

2 I forgot what John's question was. Could -- could  
3 you repeat your question? Pardon my phase out.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. Yes. The  
5 proposal wishes to tie a requirement for the placement of the  
6 blank-out "No Right Turn" signs to the presence of photo  
7 enforcement, not to, for example, the presence of a busway  
8 hazard.

9 MR. LISSNER: Okay. Right. I did it that way  
10 because -- and maybe I'm -- maybe I have just enough  
11 information or enough understanding of this to be dangerous --  
12 but my understanding of state mandates, that somebody would say  
13 you're required -- you know, if we made this a standard  
14 wherever they have a "No Right Turn on Red," even without a red  
15 light camera, somebody would say you're requiring us to do  
16 this, why isn't the state, you know, giving us the money for  
17 this because they're mandating us to do this? And -- and from  
18 my understanding, when you have a red light camera installation  
19 you have to put up red light camera warning signs. And those  
20 have not been determined to be a state mandate because you're  
21 doing an optional program, the Red Light Camera Program.

22 So at least my understanding was that an additional  
23 requirement to put up a lighted blank-out sign would fall into  
24 the same category as putting up the aluminum red light camera  
25 warning signs, namely -- not -- not a state mandate because

1 it's part of an optional program that the city has opted to do.  
2 So that's -- that's why I restricted it to that, and also  
3 because I wanted this to be a standard or something that they  
4 had to do if they had a red light camera on a "No Right Turn."

5           Anyway, could -- could you put up the -- the  
6 spreadsheet? Okay.

7           I think since the last time we were here, since  
8 February, I've completed a spreadsheet for all of the 101 red  
9 light cameras run by the MTA, and to a pretty good extent,  
10 going back the 14 years that they've had cameras. Now the --  
11 the cameras along Canoga Avenue have just been in since October  
12 of 2012. And this is -- this is part of the spreadsheet.  
13 You -- the Column DZ in the spreadsheet, you can see that on  
14 your -- on your monitors, I assume? Okay. Column DZ is the  
15 total number of citations. Jay's graph, by the way, was of  
16 violations, which is the number of times the camera flashed.  
17 He chose to use violations. All -- all I've been able to do so  
18 far on the spreadsheet is to fill in the column for actual  
19 citations issued. So Column DZ is the total citations issued  
20 all along the Orange line, well, here going back to January  
21 2012. And so you see between September 2012 and October of  
22 2012 you see that the number of violations went -- the number  
23 of citations went up by two-and-a-half times, and that's  
24 because they turned on the -- the cameras along Canoga Avenue.

25           Oh, and if you -- if you look at Column CV, which is

1 one of the cameras, you see that it started out with 215  
2 tickets. It started out kind of low for a first month. Then  
3 it went -- went down as low as 147. And -- and as of November  
4 of '13, which is the last data that I have, it was up at 392.  
5 And there's -- and there's -- out of the seven cameras  
6 enforcing the "No Right Turn on Red" along Canoga Avenue, five  
7 of them doubled like that. None of them is as high in terms of  
8 gross number of tickets as -- as Camera 1419. But five of them  
9 doubled, whereas if you look to the left and to the right of  
10 that highlighted column, those are the adjacent cameras for  
11 straight-throughs, for going across Canoga Avenue, and you  
12 don't see the doubling. I mean, it's either stayed stable or  
13 went down some.

14 Yes?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER OLENBERGER: I've just got a quick  
16 question. Do you think it's because people becoming  
17 programmed, that when they see that bus signal that the bus is  
18 coming that then they stop for a bus, even though it says "No  
19 Turn on Red," and then they don't see the little bus icon, then  
20 they're like there's no bus coming so I can cheat the system  
21 and turn? But yet they're -- do you think they've kind of  
22 become programmed, though, to that?

23 MR. LISSNER: I don't. I think -- this is some  
24 additional data that I've been getting, namely cities are  
25 becoming more candid about the percentage of visitors that are

1 getting the tickets in town. This is the last six or eight  
2 months that they've been more candid -- more candid about that.  
3 And the typical numbers are 80 to 98-1/2 percent that -- of  
4 visitors to town. So I'm -- I'm thinking that -- that it's not  
5 the locals because the locals probably already got a ticket and  
6 they definitely don't want to hazard getting another one.  
7 Okay. I think it's visitors.

8           We've got, you know, 20 million people living up in  
9 that area and there's just -- and Canoga Avenue is a very  
10 popular shopping hub. And I just think it's people --  
11 additional people coming in. And there's kind of -- it seems  
12 like there's a never-ending supply. It never goes down at  
13 these cameras. So I don't think it is people getting used to  
14 it and willing to risk it. I think it's just new people coming  
15 along who -- who don't know what to do and they screw up.

16           Anyway, okay, so the other thing about the straight-  
17 throughs versus the no rights is the ratio. You know, there's  
18 about five or ten times as many people violating the no rights  
19 as there is the straight-throughs. So it just says that for  
20 whatever reason, even with all of those red arrows and all that  
21 stuff, people are not getting it. It says it needs something  
22 further because people are violating those so much higher.

23           And -- and they're -- and it's also much higher than  
24 the whole rest of the MTA system. They have 101 cameras. And  
25 the -- the total in September '12 for the, well, for the 87

1 cameras that they had at that point, because the next month  
2 they added 14 more, for the 87 cameras that they had in  
3 September '12 they issued 2039 tickets. Now all of a sudden  
4 we've got cameras that are issuing 392 tickets, individual  
5 cameras. So these new cameras are issuing -- I mean the  
6 preexisting cameras are issuing about 23 average tickets per  
7 month per camera. And all of a sudden now we've got cameras  
8 that are issuing more than ten times that.

9           The -- I think from my perspective, I'm 68, I think  
10 some of this has to do with age, and I decided to look at that.  
11 I've now gotten samples from the court in three cities, Menlo  
12 Park, Hawthorne, Beverly Hills. The average age is 47, 47 and  
13 47 in all three cities. And in Hawthorne and in Beverly Hills  
14 there was nobody under the age of 26, nobody in the samples,  
15 small samples, about 35 tickets. Because with my resources,  
16 namely what I can request as a member of the public, I can't  
17 ask for larger samples. They will -- they say it's burdensome.  
18 So I get a sequential number of tickets. I asked for 50. Some  
19 of them were missing because they were fake tickets. They used  
20 the serial number for fake tickets. But for the actual issued  
21 tickets I have about 35 tickets per city.

22           CHAIR BAHADORI: Mr. Lissner, let's go back to the  
23 issue. I mean, just this is all very interesting stuff and you  
24 have done a lot of work, but I don't think it's going to add  
25 much value to discussion.



1           The issue is not the ticket. The Committee is not --  
2 this Committee does not concern itself with law enforcement.  
3 Our job is not -- we don't care if the city issues 10,000  
4 tickets or 2 tickets. The issue is traffic safety. If there  
5 is a traffic safety at the location, and if there is a way that  
6 we can improve the traffic safety situation, that's something  
7 that's going to be considered. If the City of L.A. or MTA or  
8 anybody issues 10,000 tickets at day at the red light camera,  
9 it's not the concern of this Committee.

10           MR. LISSNER: I understand. Yes, sir.

11           CHAIR BAHADORI: It's not our jurisdiction. So I  
12 don't think it's going to add value to your proposal, going  
13 over the statistics of the tickets. That's not really the  
14 issue for this Committee.

15           MR. LISSNER: Okay.

16           CHAIR BAHADORI: Somebody in the legislation might be  
17 interested, but not this Committee.

18           MR. LISSNER: Okay.

19           CHAIR BAHADORI: So this Committee's domain is only  
20 traffic safety.

21           MR. LISSNER: Okay.

22           CHAIR BAHADORI: So I would appreciate it if you  
23 would stay focused on your proposal.

24           MR. LISSNER: Okay. I merely offered those things  
25 to -- to show, regardless of the number of tickets, that this -

1 - this is a thing of -- it appears to be a thing of information  
2 overload and -- and which -- which is a problem that gets worse  
3 as you get older or when you're in an unfamiliar area. And  
4 thus the need for the sign where nothing else is working.

5           Let's see, I guess -- I guess that's pretty much it.  
6 I hope that we can move this forward because you -- you can see  
7 from the number of tickets that -- that problem is not getting  
8 better, it actually seems to be getting worse.

9           CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Some of -- some of the  
10 problem might be -- because my mind is like the unwarranted  
11 stop signs. The unwarranted stop signs, people learn that I  
12 can go on the stop sign because it's not really dangerous. And  
13 in this case it might be the full-time restriction and the "No  
14 Turn on Red." And it's the fact that people find out that,  
15 hey, if the bus is not coming, why am I sitting on red? So  
16 they just ignore it and they just turn.

17           MR. LISSNER: Okay.

18           CHAIR BAHADORI: It could be what Emma was saying.  
19 John?

20           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm sympathetic to the  
21 information overload issue. But I don't think that adding  
22 another restriction to the MUTCD is necessarily the way to do  
23 it. This is a complicated condition in any place where you've  
24 got a railway or a busway immediately adjacent to a highway.  
25 And I think that the practitioner has a wide variety of things

1 in the tool kit, all the way from static signs to  
2 extinguishable message signs to crossing gates to mitigate this  
3 hazard. And I am not sure that I agree with the direction of  
4 the proposal, so I'm wondering how we can bring this to  
5 conclusion. I could think MTA already has all the tools in the  
6 toolbox.

7           The presenter, I think, thinks that they're not be  
8 applied effectively because -- as evidenced by the number of  
9 violations and the number of tickets, and I'm sympathetic to  
10 that. But this sounds like a design issue. It doesn't sound  
11 to be like we ought to proceed right from the statement of  
12 issues at this intersection and intersections like it to  
13 modification of the MUTCD.

14           So I don't -- I don't know how to move forward or  
15 whether to move forward on this.

16           CHAIR BAHADORI: Well, we still have discussion. Mr.  
17 Patterson?

18           COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I was just going to -- I  
19 was just going to go along with what John was just saying. The  
20 -- but I think -- I think there is a way to resolve it because  
21 we -- we don't have the full range of issues in front of us.  
22 We only have one issue in front of us which is should we modify  
23 the MUTCD to reflect a signing requirement that would apply to  
24 all intersections in this category. And I don't -- I agree  
25 with you, there's not enough evidence. There's certainly

1 something going on at this particular intersection. We don't  
2 have enough evidence that it really warrants modification of  
3 the California MUTCD.

4 So from my perspective I would -- I would be  
5 suggesting that we deny the request and not make the changes.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I will second that motion.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: So that was a formal motion?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yeah.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yes.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I'm so sorry. It's only --  
12 it's only a discussion item.

13 CHAIR BAHADORI: Wait. Wait. So let me hear his  
14 motion. So you have a motion to not consider this?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yeah.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: And Mr. Jones kind of seconded it?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I didn't kind of, I did.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Oh, you did, actually.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Actually, he was more  
20 definite in his second than I was in my motion.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Okay. Any other  
22 discussion or comments? Mr. Kenney?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: Can we go back to -- can we  
24 go back to the photo of the intersection. Is there a bike lane  
25 immediately adjacent to that? That's one right next to that?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes, it appears so.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KENNEY: And I suspect that the "No  
3 Right Turn on Red" separately from the blank-out sign with the  
4 bus has a lot to do with that bike lane as well. And the  
5 traffic engineer who installed the "No Right Turn on Red"  
6 restriction might have been equally concerned about bicyclists  
7 along that path. There's lots of reasons why they might have  
8 installed a 24-hour "No Right Turn on Red" restriction as  
9 opposed to just a blank-out sign. And it chose to add the  
10 blank-out signs, obviously, to the buses there. But I'm not  
11 sure that the "No Right Turn on Red" has everything to do with  
12 just the busway.

13 We have a tremendous problem with turning  
14 restrictions, whether they're signs or whether they have --  
15 there's some traffic signal or blank-out signs, and that is  
16 across the board in California, people ignore those. So I  
17 don't know how this particular restriction, type of photo  
18 enforcement is really helpful in addressing that. So I don't  
19 think I'd be too supportive of something along these lines.  
20 The restrictions are there for a variety of reasons. There's  
21 all kinds of options to change that. And this -- this addition  
22 to the manual, I don't know if it's going to help anybody  
23 address those kinds of concerns.

24 MR. LISSNER: Well, I'd like to address that. And  
25 that is that if -- if -- I've talked to the -- I've tried

1 talking to the MTA, and they're not going to change this. If  
2 this group doesn't do anything you're going to continue to  
3 have, at that one example intersection, 400 people making that  
4 right turn across the bikeway, which actually has a red light  
5 also, but also across the busway. And that's going to --  
6 that's going to continue indefinitely if -- unless somebody  
7 does something.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. But Mr. Lissner, just again,  
9 I want to go back to the issue of traffic safety. I -- as you  
10 hear from the folks on the Committee, they're saying that if  
11 there's something that we can do to fix the traffic problem, if  
12 there is one, I am sympathetic personally, you know, to the fact  
13 that maybe 400 people are getting a ticket when they are doing  
14 something that is not really dangerous. But still, there's a  
15 sign up there. And if you violate it you are going to get a  
16 ticket.

17 MR. LISSNER: I'm not -- I'm not arguing it's not  
18 dangerous.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah.

20 MR. LISSNER: It is dangerous. That's why we need to  
21 stop it.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Well, I don't know if it's  
23 dangerous when there's no bus. And maybe they're having such a  
24 high number of violations because it's not really dangerous  
25 when there's not a bus and people have figured it out. And I

1 bet that most of the people who are getting tickets are  
2 actually local people who know that if there's not a bus coming  
3 it's safe to make a right, and they just make a right and they  
4 get a ticket, sadly.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman?

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yes, Mr. Marshall?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I have a question of the  
8 speaker. I wanted to have a better understanding of your  
9 concept of when would the sign be activated and when would it  
10 not? What I have understood from the presentation is that the  
11 busway doesn't use gates like a rail line does. So is the  
12 understanding that the -- the sign will be activated when  
13 there's a bus going by and -- and the restriction wouldn't  
14 apply the rest of the time? I'm not sure if I'm following the  
15 sense of how it would work.

16 MR. LISSNER: I would say if it was technically  
17 possible to activate the sign only when the bus was present,  
18 sure, only do it then. But if it's not technically possible,  
19 then just wire it into the same thing that's lighting up that  
20 sign that says bus there because that sign is not doing the  
21 job, and something needs to do the job. And then as it becomes  
22 technically feasible to light up the "No Right Turn" sign less,  
23 in other words, just at the right times when the bus is going  
24 through, sure, do that. But we need to do something quickly to  
25 -- before, you know, somebody drives in front of a bus.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And I appreciate that.  
2 So I guess that identifies for me the part I missed which is  
3 the current light-up sign is activated only when the bus is  
4 approaching and it's not lit the rest of the time?

5 MR. LISSNER: I don't know.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: If that's okay,  
7 Mr. Chair --

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Just -- okay. I really don't  
9 want to spend a lot of time on this because --

10 MR. BEEBER: I'm just answering the question.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: No. I mean, just the way that the  
12 Committee is structured, if there is not an interest on a  
13 discussion item to bring it back for public hearing, and I  
14 already have a motion they don't want to consider this, so I  
15 don't want to discuss it a lot if the Committee is not going to  
16 vote for continuing it. But go ahead.

17 MR. BEEBER: Totally up to you. I was just offering  
18 to answer the question, which is that the -- that sign lights  
19 up when the bus is coming only --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay.

21 MR. BEEBER: -- if that was the question.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Thank you.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And I -- I would like  
24 to --

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Go ahead.



1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I would like to --

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: Sure.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: -- now quickly get to my  
4 real point --

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Sure.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: -- but I needed that  
7 information to help. The manual, you know, already includes a  
8 provision for blank-out signs. And is there a need to reword  
9 the -- the way that that is set up to say -- you know, right  
10 now it just says you can prohibit those turns during certain  
11 hours of the day. I imagine cities probably use this during  
12 peak periods of something. I'll just say, you know, if the  
13 Committee was interested in this, great, if not, I don't care,  
14 perhaps that wording that just currently talks about time of  
15 day could say "or some sort of other activation when needed for  
16 conflict bus or rail lines" or whatever. Maybe that would be  
17 the thing that would free up more use of the tool that's  
18 already in the toolbox.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. One thing in general is that  
20 this document can not have anything that ties its  
21 implementation to an existence of a type of enforcement because  
22 that's what --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And I agree with that.  
24 And I'm saying I don't -- I don't want that in there either. I  
25 was thinking instead of the concept of tying it to photo

1 enforcement, I don't support the use of that paragraph either.  
2 But perhaps the thing that would make this tool work for this  
3 application was if this." Right now it just says "Only at  
4 certain times during the day," and maybe some other language  
5 there would address the situation instead of the part that we,  
6 I think, all agree we don't like.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Johnny, you have something to  
8 add?

9 Thank you, Mr. Lissner.

10 MR. BHULLAR: Just quickly, adding to a comment here  
11 in the sense that you would think I'm the editor and I know the  
12 manual like the back of my heart -- my hand, but we sometimes  
13 do make mistakes. And that's what I was discussing back with  
14 Don, as well as Kevin, in the sense that we have about, I  
15 believe, I jotted down like eight or nine signs that we  
16 identify in the blank-out portion. So the way we were  
17 interpreting it initially was that those are the ones that you  
18 can do blank-out, and that's, I think, how we have interpreted  
19 it.

20 But reading that paragraph there and, of course,  
21 getting clarification, we did not realize but the paragraph in  
22 Chapter 2L is a changeable message sign. And the paragraph  
23 that's highlighted up there in yellow basically says that any  
24 blank-out sign that is a single phase only, as long as you  
25 follow the rules of the size, color, shape of how certain signs

1 look, they can be blank-outs. So I think our interpretation  
2 would be correct in that rather than saying those identified  
3 specific ones, signs can be -- other signs can be made actual  
4 blank-out as long as it's single phase.

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you. Any other  
6 discussion, comments? Mr. Morrissey, I saw you come forward.  
7 Are you -- you had a -- I appreciate it if you are brief.

8 MR. BRONKALL: Bob Bronkall. The one part that -- or  
9 actually there are two little parts that worry me on this, is  
10 one is if it were to be considered I'd recommended that it be  
11 optional and not mandatory. That way it could be used when  
12 applicable. And the second one is the language in the current  
13 proposal that indicates that it be for parts of a particular  
14 cycle. In this particular instance, when a bus is only there  
15 on certain times when the light is red it will lead to  
16 confusion among motorists when you approach the intersection.  
17 Is it just a normal red or is it a special read with no right  
18 turn on it? Thank you.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you. Kevin, do you  
20 have something to add? Very brief please.

21 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth for Highway Administration.  
22 I'd like to point out that in Part 8, that covers light rail  
23 and railroad crossings at signalized intersections, Section  
24 8B.08 discusses turn restrictions during preemption. So there  
25 is guidance beyond what's in the changeable message sign about

1 using do not -- "No Right Turn on Red" or showing the light  
2 rail symbol to be activated during light rail or railroad  
3 crossings. There are options to use that in 8B.08.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you. And those are --  
5 those are activated when the railroad is crossing. In this  
6 case these are full-time prohibition. You can not make a turn  
7 on that, period.

8 Muna, do you have something to say very quickly, just  
9 like 30 seconds please?

10 MS. CUTHBERT: Muna Cuthbert, City of Chula Vista.  
11 City of Santee here, they do have a bus. Probably Mike is  
12 familiar with it. Sometimes we put the T for transit, the two  
13 signs, maybe one sign "No Turn on Red" should be removed if  
14 there is a blank, and then the controller can do a lot of  
15 things for you to give you the right arrow, nobody turn right  
16 when it's (inaudible) nobody turn on red. I thought I'd share  
17 that experience because I went to visit the City of Santee.  
18 They have very good signalling and blank, and they use it very  
19 effective.

20 CHAIR BAHADORI: Sure.

21 MS. CUTHBERT: Thanks.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: Thank you. Okay. I have a motion.  
23 Okay. The way that this thing works is that they come under  
24 discussion. We can not make -- we can not take action or vote  
25 on changing California MUTCD until the item is under public

1 hearing section. So what we do is that we bring it under  
2 discussion. If the Committee wishes to further consider, then  
3 it's moved next meeting or whenever it's ready for the public  
4 hearing. So now it's a discussion. I already have a motion  
5 and a second for us not to consider this any further. And  
6 we've heard comments and -- yes, Mr. Patterson?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Would it be possible to  
8 make a friendly amendment to my motion?

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: Absolutely. It's your motion.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: And that was that while  
11 we wouldn't consider it, I think that what was just raised and  
12 whether or not there's any advantage of considering busways in  
13 addition to NRT in the section on the blank-out signs that  
14 Johnny had up on the screen just a minute ago, which was  
15 Section 8B-2, I think, or something like that, because that  
16 would be something that I would support bringing back. Because  
17 this is just a different kind of application, same kind of  
18 preemption strategy. And it seems to me that the blank-out  
19 signs could be -- if we just made it clear that they could be  
20 used for busways which have limited application in the state it  
21 would solve -- it would at least address this issue.

22 But -- but still I would still support not bringing  
23 back this issue for further discussion in terms of the -- what  
24 was recommended today in that it's really a design issue and  
25 not a change to the MUTCD.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Sure. So that's your motion.

2 John?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: A comment on your --  
4 your motion. You mentioned light rail. There is a W10-7  
5 activated blank-out sign displaying an approaching rail  
6 vehicle. It seems to me that the bus sign that MTA has put up  
7 there is their best attempt to simulate a W10-7 for a bus  
8 context.

9 So one item to think about is a narrow context of bus  
10 -- of transit ways, to generalize the term, would be does the  
11 MUTCD in a slightly modified version of the W10-7 represent a  
12 bus?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Right. And that would  
14 be the Section 8B.08 that's up on the screen right now would be  
15 modified.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Figure 8B-4, if you're  
17 interested.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. I think we've had discussion  
19 enough on this. Seeing no one else and no Committee Members,  
20 so your motion is not to consider this the way it is presented,  
21 for one thing we can not -- because we can not have any changes  
22 that ties any part of the manual to an existence of a photo  
23 enforcement as that's an enforcement issue, it's not an  
24 engineering. And so your -- your recommendation is not to  
25 proceed with this as proposed, but you're willing to look at --

1 revisit a busway signage and signal in the general context;  
2 right?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yes, with no connection  
4 to --

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: With no connection to --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: -- photo enforcement  
7 section.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: And so you want to have Caltrans  
9 take a look at it. And Johnny, maybe (inaudible) need to  
10 change any part of that section.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Okay.

12 CHAIR BAHADORI: And that's your second also on the  
13 motion?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I can support that.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. So that's the motion. All  
16 those in favor say aye?

17 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Any opposed? No opposed? Okay.  
19 The motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much, Mr.  
20 Lissner, for bringing it. And Caltrans is going to look at the  
21 busway section and see if we can fit something in that area, at  
22 that location.

23 Moving on to information items, item 14-14, proposal  
24 to amend Section 2H.02, the general information signs.

25 Mr. Singh?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Don?

2 CHAIR BAHADORI: Don?

3 MR. HOWE: Back in February we received instruction  
4 from our governor to adopt the Emergency Drought Declaration.  
5 And so Caltrans, we developed a Water Conservation and Drought  
6 Action Plan. Part of this mentions recycled water. In  
7 reviewing that they were saying is there a sign that we can use  
8 from time to time when we -- our state has a drought? The last  
9 time around, I believe, was 1994 we had the use and recycle --  
10 or "Using Reclaimed Water" sign. And the term has been edited  
11 in six different California codes to be recycled water. So our  
12 proposal is to -- well, it's already completed. We wanted to  
13 bring this forward as an information item so that we could  
14 update the 2014 California MUTCD. And so the -- the language  
15 that we're proposing is to just change the word "Reclaimed" to  
16 "Recycled." So that's an information item, just for you --  
17 your --

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: This is for Committee  
20 information. We already adopted this sign because we were  
21 under pressure. And we want to let you know, that's what we  
22 did. So comments --

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: Already something you've done.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Any comment will be taken --

25 CHAIR BAHADORI: Well, somebody much smarter than me



1 decided recycled is better reclaimed and it's worth all the  
2 cost of changing signs, so more power to you.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chair --

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- I think this is a  
6 great support for bicycling, and I'll tell you why. Because  
7 any time I see a behavioral change from claimed to cycled, I'm  
8 all for it.

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: There you go. So now I know what  
10 the agenda was. That's the -- there's always a story behind a  
11 story. Okay.

12 The last item, I believe, on the agenda is the  
13 information item about engineering judgment compliance dates.  
14 Is that --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Well, I will ask Johnny to  
16 just give brief statement, what we're going to do in June.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: This is a heads-up, huh?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

19 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.  
20 Basically, what we had started out two years back as part of  
21 the federal region that went into effect at the national level  
22 and we had two years to adopt. So those two particular regions  
23 are Region 1 which dealt with the definition of the standard or  
24 the shall, of the word shall in the manual, as well as the  
25 second element to that was the compliance dates and removal of

1 a number of compliance dates. So we have already handled that  
2 issue as -- on the CTCDC agenda.

3 But, however, the reason why I have it here is that  
4 this is the reason and the key which triggers us to change  
5 officially our California MUTCD to embrace Region 1 and 2. So  
6 what I'm asking -- or at least letting the Committee, first of  
7 all, be aware is that, yes, Region 1 and 2 of the National  
8 MUTCD, we will be incorporating. But also now, on June 13th we  
9 will be issuing a new manual which will be, I would say, a  
10 revision from our current 2012 manual. And what it's going to  
11 include is the National MUTCD Revision 1 and 2, and then it's  
12 going to include all the CTCDC recommendations of 2012, 2013,  
13 up until this meeting. And apart from that there are two or  
14 three, I think, of these policy memos that Caltrans issued, and  
15 they are posted on our website, and I am including that as  
16 well. And in addition to that there are some minor editorial  
17 errata type of stuff that I have not shared. But those --  
18 since I have under my authority as editor, without a policy  
19 change I can go in and make some changes just to clean up.

20 So what we are doing is there are a number of  
21 figures, probably I would say touching almost every figure,  
22 where we have had one of our engineers go in and start posting  
23 the sign codes in every sign. So wherever you see a sign we're  
24 trying to post a code to it. Any time you say a designation in  
25 any figures, regardless of whether it's a federal or a

1 California figure, we had our engineers identify which  
2 particular detail from the pavement marking details there are  
3 so that you know specifically exactly the detail there is.

4           Apart from that I believe then there are some other  
5 just corrections, things that have crossed my desk. So those  
6 are the stuff that we are working on. And between now and June  
7 13th we will complete that. And I seek -- I just want to make,  
8 first of all, the Committee aware that that's what's happening.  
9 And with that, if there's anything missing or any questions or  
10 comments for me let me know, because now is the opportunity to  
11 make this revision. Because we had, as part of the CTCDC  
12 discussed in the past, we will not have our manual be a living  
13 document, or having it as a moving target. It's going to be a  
14 fixed document, no sooner than two years, no longer than five  
15 years when we revise it. So now the last issue was January  
16 13th of 2012. So now we are two years into it. So on June  
17 13th we'll issue the new manual, and we'll be within that  
18 framework.

19           Any questions for me?

20           COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: One comment. If any Member  
21 knows of any editorial correction is needed, you can go ahead  
22 and email to Johnny or me, so we will make that correction to  
23 the text, any (inaudible) which is not changing the policy but  
24 just editorial.

25           CHAIR BAHADORI: Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much.

1 Any questions? Okay. Thank you. We are done with the  
2 information items.

3 On tabled items, there are three of them. Do we need  
4 to discuss any of them?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: No. No action.

6 CHAIR BAHADORI: Should we just skip them?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: Next meeting. Our next meeting,  
9 first, let's decide about location. Where do we want to have  
10 it? We have had it up north. We've had it down here in the  
11 south.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So Mr. Bryan Jones wants to  
13 host next meeting in Fremont. So most probably it will be  
14 Fremont. And we want to schedule sometime in September. Look  
15 at which day is okay.

16 CHAIR BAHADORI: So --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I'm open to --

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: So first let me ask Mr. Jones if  
19 Fremont is doable?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes.

21 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Fremont is doable. Now let's  
22 look at the date. If you go to your calendars, please, in  
23 September, do you want early part or the mid?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: That's -- it would be in the  
25 middle.

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: It depends on Caltrans, when you  
2 guys are going to be ready. Middle? So you want to do second  
3 or third week? You want to do the 11th or 18th?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: 18th, not. 11th? 11th is  
5 okay with everybody?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: If we can go later. Can we  
7 do the next week in September?

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: We can't do the 18th.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: The 25th? The 25th?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: The 25th is going to be like the  
12 last week in September. Is that okay?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: The 18th?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The 18th.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Oh, the 18th?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: No. The 18th is a  
17 conference for CEAC.

18 CHAIR BAHADORI: Oh, okay. So you may miss some  
19 people.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So us county folks would  
21 not be available.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: The 25th?

23 CHAIR BAHADORI: The 25th seems to be -- yeah, some  
24 people are going to go to CEAC Conference.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So 25th is okay?

1 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So we'll -- we'll see.

3 Sometimes the room is not available. So we can work back and  
4 forth, maybe one week before, one week after, you know, so  
5 we'll see. And I will make sure that members available before  
6 we finalize the date.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. We are done with our agenda.

8 Again, I would like to say farewell to our member who  
9 is not going to come back. Mr. Patterson, it was a pleasure.  
10 Hope to see you in our future meetings.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I hope to be here. And  
12 it's been a pleasure working with the Members of CTCDC. I've  
13 actually really enjoyed the time, and the time that we've spent  
14 doing good work, including the 13 hours on the 3-seconds issue.

15 CHAIR BAHADORI: Yes. And how did you like putting  
16 in 13 hours on the 3-second issue.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: So that is September 25th.  
18 If there's any change we will discuss with the Committee  
19 Members.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Can I ask, just for one  
21 clarification, last month Caltrans director Malcolm Dougherty  
22 made a formal endorsement of NACTO's guidelines. What does  
23 that mean for the California MUTCD or a local jurisdiction  
24 using that? Do they have to still go through an MUTCD  
25 experiment process or can they just use whatever is in NACTO,

1 or are we incorporating that stuff into MUTCD or --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Let's let Johnny answer that  
3 question. I know a little bit too.

4 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Yes,  
5 basically what our director is saying is that the NACTO  
6 guidelines, officially Caltrans has started looking into them,  
7 and we're doing it in two pieces. One is the design side. Our  
8 design folks are looking at it from the design perspective.  
9 And our office is supposed to be looking at it from the traffic  
10 control device perspective. But since we were too occupied  
11 with our June 13th -- so what we have indicated is that design  
12 is pretty much done with their work. I think maybe another  
13 week or so at the most. And then as soon as we're done with  
14 our effort here, then in a matter of a month or so we will be  
15 going into the NACTO guideline and seeing.

16 So our director is basically saying we are accepting  
17 it and just going in there and seeing what and how -- what  
18 needs to be modified. So -- but by end of July or so we will  
19 be officially making at least I would say our stand known as to  
20 for design and traffic control device perspective, how are we  
21 going to accept the NACTO guidelines, at least for Caltrans.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. That -- it was just  
23 unclear. And there's a lot of people saying what -- what does  
24 that mean for us, or how is it going to be implemented. And so  
25 I hadn't gotten a clear direction on that, so I just wanted to

1 bring it up to you guys. I figured the wisdom between the two  
2 of you would bring some clarity to it.

3 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. The Division of Design is  
4 actually -- they had to do their part because we couldn't  
5 hardly spare -- we were working on the June 13th update. But  
6 we are actively involved.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: something I want to make  
8 clear, we don't have -- there is going to be law to  
9 recommending those guidelines be adopted. However, we don't  
10 have the striping and signing, how to put on the roadway. So  
11 we will, you know, we will entertain any experimentation  
12 request on this topic.

13 MR. BHULLAR: So just in a nutshell, the way we will  
14 be approaching, and I'm not saying right now that I -- that  
15 this is how it is, but the way we are going to approach this is  
16 we are going to look at the NACTO guidelines and see how it  
17 affects our current California MUTCD, and if there's any  
18 changes that need to be made into the manual to embrace that or  
19 vice versa. So that's our back and forth to looking at,  
20 whether our manual needs to be changed or the NACTO guideline  
21 need to be modified a little bit to a piece to the California  
22 MUTCD, that's how Caltrans is going to look at it and then  
23 accept it as part of our (inaudible) solution.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Hey, Johnny, do you  
25 think you'd be ready to discuss that at the September



1 meeting --

2 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: -- at least the status?

4 MR. BHULLAR: Oh, definitely. Because our office is  
5 on the forefront on the review. And by the end of July we'll  
6 be done. So I can even, before that, send you the electronic,  
7 whatever, email through formatting or whatever, and I can  
8 easily present it to you at that time.

9 CHAIR BAHADORI: Can you -- can you put this like  
10 maybe at least as an information item or a discussion item on  
11 the agenda for September?

12 MR. BHULLAR: All right, yes. That's a good --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Yes, we can do that.

14 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay.

15 MR. BHULLAR: So we'll just place it as a placeholder  
16 for now.

17 CHAIR BAHADORI: A discussion item --

18 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

19 CHAIR BAHADORI: -- so that at least the Committee  
20 has some time to discuss.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Sure.

22 CHAIR BAHADORI: And maybe I, for one, understand  
23 better what's going on. I'm sure other Members have questions.

24 MR. BHULLAR: So definitely, we'll cover that in the  
25 September meeting.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I would guess this has  
2 raised substantial -- I would guess that CBAC is interested, as  
3 well. Are you going to run this by CBAC, the state bike  
4 committee?

5 MR. BHULLAR: Well, the way I would like to answer  
6 that is that as far as we are concerned, design and traffic,  
7 because of California MUTCD and the Highway Design Manual, we  
8 are looking at it just from that perspective. CBAC and others,  
9 I'm not involved with that. I'm not sure if they are looking  
10 at it, how they are, I would say, participating in this effort.  
11 I'm a little bit out of the picture on that.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, CBAC is advisory  
13 to Caltrans --

14 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. Yeah.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- as are we, really.  
16 So it seems to me like they ought to be in the loop. I expect  
17 to have questions from --

18 MR. BHULLAR: Well, I think --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- from CBAC come to  
20 CTCDC.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. As far as I'm aware I think the  
22 way it's working is that they are independently looking at it.  
23 But we as design engineers and traffic engineers are just  
24 eternally reviewing it directly without any outside input. But  
25 CBAC might be doing it independently as a parallel overview.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Can we turn off -- just stop  
2 the recording?

3 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: Just stop the recording.

5 CHAIR BAHADORI: Oh, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait.  
6 This is a public meeting. You can't just stop recording.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: No, we ended the meeting.

8 CHAIR BAHADORI: You can -- if you are -- if you want  
9 any discussion you can do it offline after the meeting is done.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER SINGH: I think we ended meeting.

11 CHAIR BAHADORI: This is a public meeting. You can  
12 not just -- if you have something you want to discuss offline  
13 you wait until the meeting is finished and then you discuss it.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And I have a short  
15 second question, and that is -- you don't have to commit to  
16 this, but I was just curious based on our earlier discussion  
17 about the process, how do you imagine this will eventually  
18 express itself, as an OPT-E (phonetic), as a policy memo?

19 MR. BHULLAR: Well, once we identify, if there's a  
20 change that needs to be made in the California MUTCD to accept  
21 a portion of the NACTO guidelines or vice versa that the NACTO  
22 guideline needs to be modified for Caltrans projects, whichever  
23 way, and I'm guessing maybe there will be somewhat of both, and  
24 when that happens then once we are going to have a notification  
25 as to what we are doing then we will, of course, start

1 following up with this Committee on what changes need to be  
2 made to our manual. And then, of course, on the -- the design  
3 folks on the NACTO side.

4 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you. Any other  
5 questions, comments? Okay. I need a motion for adjournment.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: First.

7 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. Hey, there's a motion. Is  
8 there a second?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Second.

10 CHAIR BAHADORI: Okay. There you go. Your last  
11 second. Okay. Our meeting is adjourned. See you back on  
12 September 25th or 18th, whatever he said. Thank you.

13 (Whereupon the California Traffic Control Devices  
14 Committee adjourned at 2:35 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Martha L. Nelson, attest that the foregoing proceedings were transcribed to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney of the parties, nor financially interested in the action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 27<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2014.

/s/ Martha L. Nelson